



DEVELOPMENT

OF THE

The Right Reverend

The Lord Bishop of Ely.

With the Author's best respects.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY
200 TAPSCOTT DRIVE
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48106-1000
TEL: 734-763-5000
WWW.UMICH.EDU

300 Super Mall P. W.

244-7548 W.W.

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

REV. DR WISEMAN'S REPLY

TO

DR TURTON'S

*ROMAN CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST
CONSIDERED.*

By THOMAS TURTON, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE,

AND

DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.

CAMBRIDGE:

PRINTED BY JOHN W. PARKER, UNIVERSITY PRINTER.

FOR J. & J. J. DEIGHTON, CAMBRIDGE;

AND

JOHN W. PARKER, LONDON.

M.DCCC.XXXIX.

CONTENTS.

SECTION I.

MODE OF CONTROVERSY.

	PAGE
THE author's apology	1
Dr Wiseman's complaints :	
(1) Harsh language	2
(2) Exaggeration	11
(3) Learning under-rated.....	12
Estius—Maldonatus, &c.	15
Dr Wiseman's test applied to his own Lectures	18
The author's purpose	20

SECTION II.

STRUCTURE OF THE SIXTH CHAPTER OF ST JOHN.

Importance of Dr Wiseman's division	22
Reasons for the division :	
(1) Inference from <i>Verily, verily</i>	28
(2) Identical expressions differently applied.....	30
(3) Poetical parallelisms	32
Matt. xxiv. 43. similar to John vi. 48	33
Maldonatus, Cornelius à Lapide, Calmet.....	49

SECTION III.

HERMENEUTICAL PRINCIPLES—COUNCIL OF TRENT.

Transition from a word or phrase to an entire discourse	53
Motives of the Council of Trent.....	56
Different views of John vi.	64

SECTION IV.

CHANGE OF SUBJECT IN THE SIXTH CHAPTER OF ST JOHN.

Dr Wiseman's objections to the author's statements :	
(1) Not <i>idea</i> but <i>word</i>	67
(2) Could not possibly misunderstand	70
Reason for change of subject :	
First, God the giver ; then, Christ	74
Falsification of Dr Wiseman's words	77
Misrepresentation of his sentiments.....	80

SECTION V.

JEWISH PREJUDICES, AND MODES OF INTERPRETING OUR
LORD'S DISCOURSES.

	PAGE
Mr Burke's maxim	84
Our Lord's meaning <i>wrongly</i> understood :	
(1) John iii. 3—6: Nicodemus	92
(2) Matt. xvi. 6: Leaven of the Pharisees	96
People of Capernaum.....	101
Our Lord's meaning <i>rightly</i> understood :	
Matt. ix. 2—6: <i>Thy sins be forgiven thee</i>	105
Adverse instances :	
(1) John ii. 18—22: <i>Destroy this temple</i>	112
(2) John iv. 10—15: The woman of Samaria	118

SECTION VI.

OUR LORD'S ANSWER TO THE JEWS, AND HIS CONDUCT TO
HIS DISCIPLES.

The case of Tittmann	122
The case of Mr Faber	136
Interpretation of John vi. 55: <i>meat indeed</i>	142
Interpretation of John vi. 60: <i>hard saying</i>	145
Divines sanctioning the author's views :	
(1) Doddridge	148
(2) Titimann	149
(3) Dr Lingard	150
The case of Estius, resumed from p. 16	151
Dr Wiseman's authorities examined :	
(1) Maldonatus	154
(2) Cornelius à Lapide	156
(3) Calmet	158
Roman Catholic authorities opposed to Dr Wiseman :	
(1) Glossa Ordinaria	158
(2) Nicolas de Lyra	159
(3) Erasmus, Cajetan, Titelman, Tolet, &c.	160
Estius finally resumed—conclusion	161

SECTION I.

MODE OF CONTROVERSY.

1. Two chapters of Dr Wiseman's *Reply* are occupied by a review of "the style and manner" of the strictures, which have been published, on his *Lectures on the Eucharist*. In the first of those chapters, the learned writer more especially remonstrates against the harsh terms employed by myself, in my *Roman Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist considered*. Now, far from being attached to the language of reproof, I for my own part sincerely lament that Dr Wiseman should have had any reason to complain of such language; and I entreat that whatever phrase or sentence can be justly deemed unwarrantable may be considered as withdrawn. Comments indeed, stronger than the occasion requires, undoubtedly tend to weaken the effects of argument; and whether Dr Wiseman is right or wrong in the opinion, which he seems to hold (p. 18), that such is the result in my own case—I certainly shall not permit another edition of the work in question to appear, presenting expressions which are likely to have that tendency.

It was not till very near the close of the year 1836, that I became acquainted with Dr Wiseman's volume on the Eucharist. Not being then aware that anything had been written, or was designed to be written, in the way of remarks upon that production—and thinking that some remarks upon it were required—I determined to put down what occurred to me, as well as the little leisure, which I could command, would allow. And thus, amidst the distractions of business—and, I may add, during a protracted illness—the work was sent to the printer in portions as it was written, and was finally published about Easter 1837. This statement will in some measure account for the existence of a volume less courteous in tone, and more diffuse in style, than I trust it would have been, under less unfavourable circumstances. Unaccustomed to disguise my sentiments, I fairly mention what has struck me, on looking through the book for the first time since it appeared—that is, after an interval of more than two years. On this subject I will only add, that the acknowledgment now offered would have been the same, whatever might have been the occasion of examining my treatise on the Eucharist.

2. After the statement just made on my own behalf, it is but right to observe, with regard to Dr Wiseman, that, even when argument is quite

out of the question, there is often great difficulty in dealing with his positions. For example: In his *Reply* (p. 6), he mentions the *Protestant Journal*—a publication entirely unknown to me—in which, as he informs us, some one, when commenting on his Lectures, “*weeps* at his *wickedness*”—asserting that “there is no mistaking the *infernal* spirit of these passages”—that “there is an *infernal* spirit, which struggles with every effort of which the man was capable, to make sceptics, or infidels, since he could not make them Romanists.” Dr Wiseman then affirms that, “throughout Dr Turton’s book, a similar form of objection prevails;” and proceeds to give, as an instance, a remark of mine—which, after transcribing the sentence that called it forth, I shall adduce. In the Lectures on the Eucharist (p. 86), I found the following passage, relating to the latter part of our Lord’s discourse to the Jews, in the sixth chapter of St John’s Gospel:

“Our Saviour’s object in his discourses to the Jews, was to gain them over to the doctrines of Christianity; and he, therefore, must be supposed to propose those doctrines in the manner most likely to gain their attention, and conciliate their esteem. *At least, it is repugnant to suppose him selecting the most revolting images, wherein to clothe his dogmas, disguising his most amiable institutions under the semblance of things the most wicked and abominable in the opinion of his hearers, and inculcating his most saving and most beautiful principles, by the most impious and horrible illustrations.*”

On the preceding sentence, printed in italics, I commented (p. 111) in the following terms:

“The consciousness of being liable to error ought to have restrained any man, when approaching that subject, from the use of such expressions as we there find. If a prize were to be awarded to that writer, who should employ the most gross and offensive terms, in describing our Lord’s discourse, Dr Wiseman’s sentence could scarcely fail to ensure success.”

These animadversions of mine form part of an extract which Dr Wiseman gives, as “a fair specimen of this favourite mode of arguing followed by Dr Turton.” And now, let the reader carefully weigh the import of Dr Wiseman’s account of our Lord’s discourse. Let him then judge for himself, how far my “form of objection” is similar to that of the Protestant Journal, when denouncing “the *infernal* spirit” of certain passages in Dr Wiseman’s writings; and also, with what success I have encountered the difficulty of criticising such expressions as were then before me. For specimens of the learned author’s own mode of treating Protestant writers, in his Lectures—in which he had, as he states (*Reply*, p. 4), “unaffectedly avoided all harsh expressions, as well as rancour of mind”—I refer to a subsequent page (19, 20). I am reluctant to transcribe such passages more than once; but it is necessary that they should be borne in mind, in order that the cause, between Dr Wiseman and his opponents, may be fairly decided; and

therefore I here give one example of Dr Wiseman's language, in a work not written in reply to an adversary, but professing simply to state "the scriptural proofs" of the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist:—"I could occupy you long by extracts from Protestants, full of the most ribald scurrility, when speaking of this blessed institution. But considering them, as we must do, at least ignorantly blasphemous, I will not shock your ears, nor pollute my lips, by repeating what can in no manner strengthen their case, with virtuous or sensible men."

It would be difficult to find, even amidst the warmth of controversy, expressions more violent and improper than those which Dr Wiseman has here used—under circumstances which should have induced him to forget, for a season at least, that such subjects had ever been discussed with intemperate zeal. But in fact there is, throughout the volume, an ill-disguised intolerance of Protestant interpretations. These things are mentioned, not by any means as an excuse for the faults I may have committed in the same way; but as a hint that he, who has thus transgressed without any apparent temptation, ought not to be very forward in first casting the stone.

Dr Wiseman however, in his *Reply* (p. 10), thus vindicates such expressions, as those relating to our Lord's discourse above-mentioned—

when employed by himself and Roman Catholic writers in general: "The Catholic is sure that he has an infallible authority for what he believes; and consequently does not assert opinions but truths. This is a principle which calls forth peculiar indignation from Dr Turton. But whoever holds it, as I, with the Holy Catholic Church, sincerely do, must feel a confidence, such as perhaps a Protestant divine cannot, in conclusions which accord with the decisions of God's Church, even where those conclusions are worked out by reasoning and research." Notions of this kind might be alleged as a sanction for any principles, or any disquisitions, which, however groundless or however ill-conducted, might *seem* to lead to the doctrines of the Church of Rome. They therefore prove too much. But admitting, for the sake of argument, that a decision of that Church will warrant language like that of Dr Wiseman, he ought certainly to be able to produce the decision when he uses the language. What, then, is the fact, with regard to the sixth chapter of St John? In the exposition of that chapter, Dr Wiseman is confident, but his Church wavers. He interprets the latter part of the discourse, of the Eucharist, as boldly as if, to adopt his own phrase, he had "an infallible authority for what he believes"—whereas the Roman Catholic Church itself, as bound by the Council of Trent, leaves its members to interpret that por-

tion, of the Eucharist, or not, as they may think proper. And thus, even according to his own principles, he may be "asserting opinions" and not "truths". There is indeed, throughout Dr Wiseman's four Lectures on this chapter, a mode of introducing the doctrine of his Church, which has probably misled many readers. In p. 39, he thus lays claim to "the Catholic"—as in favour of his views:

"The Catholic maintains that, at this point, a total though natural change of subject takes place, and a perfect transition is made from believing in Christ, to a real eating of his body and drinking of his blood, in the sacrament of the Eucharist. The generality of Protestants maintain that no such transition takes place, but that our Saviour really continues to discourse upon the same subject as before, that is, on faith. I have said the generality of Protestants, because there is a variety of opinion among them."

From this account, the obvious inference is, that there is no "variety of opinion", among Roman Catholics, on that subject. Again, in p. 94, Dr Wiseman thus writes:

"Thus far, then, we have the strongest testimony we can require, to our Saviour's having passed, in his discourse, to the literal eating of his flesh. One thing now only remains to decide the question finally: were the Jews *right*, in so understanding him, or were they *wrong*? If they were *right*, then so are the Catholics, who likewise take his words literally; if *wrong*, then Protestants are right, when they understand him figuratively.... In order to decide this important point, now becomes the hinge of the question between the two religions, &c. &c."

Representations like these being continued to the close of the last Lecture on the 6th chapter of St John, it is, up to that point, difficult for the reader to imagine that the real question at issue between Roman Catholics and Protestants, does not depend upon that chapter. He must learn, from other sources than those four Lectures, that Roman Catholics are permitted by their own Church to symbolize with Protestants, in explaining the latter part of the discourse figuratively and spiritually. Such, however, is the fact; and the consequence is, that the strange language employed by Dr Wiseman, respecting our Lord's expressions, does not less affect many Roman Catholics than it affects Protestants—if, indeed, it has any assignable bearing upon any persons whatever.

But Dr Wiseman has another mode of defence: "In any case," he writes (p. 10), "it is evident that whoever so far insists upon a text, as to say that any other interpretation appears to involve contradiction or absurdity, intends only to make a *reductio ad impossibile*, as the schoolmen call it; that is, to propose an only alternative which no one can for a moment choose." On this I remark: 1. that neither the *reductio ad impossibile*, nor any other form of argument, can excuse the use of indecorous words: 2. that our Lord's expressions, described by Dr Wiseman in such offensive terms, remain the same, however they may

be interpreted: 3. that Dr Wiseman's interpretation seems to tend less, to the removal of difficulties arising from those expressions, than any other interpretation—whether Roman Catholic or Protestant: 4. that the interpretations opposed by Dr Wiseman have not been shown by him to “involve contradiction or absurdity.” Let me add that there are—if I am not greatly misinformed, which I do not believe—numbers of intelligent Roman Catholics, in this country, extremely dissatisfied with many of the principles laid down by Dr Wiseman, as well as with his mode of reasoning from them—however they may agree with him in his doctrine of the Eucharist.

The fact is—and it ought to be distinctly stated—that a great part of what I have written, on the 6th chapter of St John, is as much on behalf of Roman Catholic divines, as of Protestant writers. There are Roman Catholic divines who agree with Protestant writers, in understanding our Lord's discourse simply in a spiritual sense; and there are Roman Catholic divines who agree with Protestant writers, in applying the latter part of the discourse (but in different ways) to the Eucharist. Of the modes of interpretation here alluded to, it may be affirmed, that they are straight-forward and intelligible; whereas Dr Wiseman's exposition is tortuous—and, so far as I can perceive, irremediably perplexed.....In the interpretation of this chapter, at all events, the

position of Dr Wiseman, with respect both to Roman Catholics and Protestants, stands some chance of being, in the end, well ascertained.

Dr Wiseman moreover, (*Reply*, p. 11), vindicates some language, which I strongly reprobated, by the practice of the Fathers. Richard of St Victor, for instance, exclaims—"Lord, if there is a mistake, we are deceived by thyself:" St Augustine addresses his adversary—"You would have Christ a liar, and yourself true:" and St Jerome—"Accuse God therefore of falsehood, &c." The learned author also cites Bishop Jewell, saying—"O Gregory! O Augustine! O Hierome!..... O Paul! O Christ! if we be deceived herein, ye are they that have deceived us." With reference to these passages, Dr Wiseman writes (p. 15): "Dr Turton is, or ought to be, conversant with the writings of the Fathers; he must have been familiar with these forms of argument so frequent in them, and other divines. Has he acted justly, or wisely, in forgetting them on such an occasion?" How others may feel in this case, I know not; but I should be ashamed of myself, if I could hesitate to condemn such expressions, whether in ancient Fathers or modern divines—whether in Richard of St Victor or Bishop Jewell;—I may add, whether sanctioned by the English College at Rome, or (as appears to be the fact) by Maynooth College in Ireland.—Finally, I cannot agree with Dr Wiseman (p. 12) in think-

ing that "if the reader will dispassionately consider such texts as 1 John i. 10, and v. 10, he perhaps will not consider the form of reasoning either so modern or so disrespectful." The reader, I suspect, will be of opinion, that the commission of St John, both with regard to sentiment and language, was very different from that of Augustine — to say nothing of more recent writers.

3. Dr Wiseman having said, in his Lectures (p. 140)—"No one will consider *flesh* an equivalent to this [i.e. *letter*]; especially in a chapter [John vi.] wherein it has been used twenty times in its ordinary meaning"—the notion, of the word *flesh* being used *twenty times* in this one chapter, drew from me (p. 212) the following remarks: "We are informed that the word *flesh* has been used *twenty times* in this sixth chapter. Now, from a love of accuracy, I wish to observe that the word had been used just five times by our Lord, and just once by the Jews. Not that I deem this an extraordinary exaggeration in Dr Wiseman; whose imagination is somewhat of a romantic cast." On these remarks, the learned author thinks it worth while thus to comment:

"The gentleman, who writes thus, displays a particular horror for exaggeration in any form, even the most innocent. For instance, I had observed, according to a form of speech

usual both in common conversation (and these Lectures were originally orally delivered) and in every writer from Moses downwards, that our Saviour had used an expression *twenty times*; meaning, of course, as every one not engaged in controversy would have understood, *often*. This draws down a severe reproof, as an exaggeration; and my imagination is said to be somewhat of a romantic cast."—Again, "I would recommend to Dr Turton's perusal the chapter *De Synecdoche Speciei* in Glassius's *Philologia Sacra*, p. 1257, in Dathe's edition, upon this use of numbers in Scripture. I must also observe that, in its proper place, I had accurately stated the number of times the phrase was used, while here the subject came in indirectly." (*Reply*, p. 19.)

Having thus laid Dr Wiseman's grievance before the reader, I will merely say that I really did not suppose that the "reproof" would be thought particularly "severe"; and will conclude, with this declaration—that if Dr Wiseman's appeal to the usages of "common conversation"—to antiquity sacred and profane, with writers of every kind whether more or less modern—and to Glassius's *Philologia Sacra* in particular—be held favourable to his use of round numbers in the case before us, I shall in no wise contest the point. From what I have observed of Dr Wiseman's mode of animadversion, I verily believe that he would have employed much stronger language in a similar instance:—but enough on this subject—let us pass on to other matters.

4. It must, I think, be obvious to every reader of my volume on the Eucharist—so at least I intended it to be—that I considered Dr Wise-

man as a man of great learning and singular acuteness; and if, in the course of the work, any thing should appear not quite in accordance with that estimate of his character, the blame must be thrown upon some casual awkwardness of expression. Having unfortunately stated that Dr Wiseman was “learned after the manner of a controversialist, not after that of a student”—he understands the observation in the most unfavourable sense—and reverts to it, throughout his *Reply*, with great indignation. Let me endeavour to explain my meaning. An advocate may be a sounder lawyer and an abler man than a judge is. The talents of the two functionaries are exerted in different ways. The advocate does the best he can for his client. His object is, to make an impression. If a desirable event has occurred a few times, he employs round numbers—it has happened twenty times in a very short interval:—and so on. The judge has other views; and calculates and deliberates accordingly. No one on this account conceives the advocate’s legal knowledge to be impugned. Such was the kind of distinction which I had drawn, in my own mind, between the controversialist and the student. I never intended to question Dr Wiseman’s learning. The learned author, however, avails himself (*Reply*, p. 25) of my allusion to the controversialist and the student, for the purpose of describing me as “a patient follower of his steps; a most diligent verifier of all his quotations; a

most pains-taking, though extremely irritable, commentator upon all his pages”.....“I think,” Dr Wiseman continues, “poor Estius about the only Catholic author he refers to without any suggestion from me, and therefore he makes much of him, exalting him from time to time into something great.” In this strain, the learned author perseveres.—Now, a patient and pains-taking commentator is, after all, a very respectable character; and having so far secured Dr Wiseman’s approbation, I have an additional reason for persevering in my endeavours to do my duty in that capacity.—With regard to Dr Wiseman’s remarks upon the want of recondite references in my volume, I would observe, that a display of erudition—that is, an appeal to authors, accessible only to the learned, beyond what is absolutely necessary—being always inexpressibly odious to me, I resolved to restrict myself, as much as possible, to such writers as appeared to possess Dr Wiseman’s good opinion—in order that the authorities referred to might be in some sort common to us both. On this principle, I made use of Bellarmine; whose “magnificent *Controversies*” Dr Wiseman had mentioned in his preface, with great delight. When he supposes that “poor Estius is about the only Catholic author I refer to without any suggestion from himself”—I can venture to say—not only that Roman Catholic authors unnamed by Dr Wiseman are quoted—but that there is a small mistake, even

with regard to “poor Estius.” The fact is, that Dr Wiseman had himself directed me to Estius, (Lectures, p. 159)—by the following language: “Hence Estius expressly writes, and other divines acknowledge, that there is not the same strength in the proof drawn from the discourse in St John, as in the words of Institution.” The passage of Estius referred to is thus given—“Comment. in iv Libros Sentent. *Par.* 1696. p. 114.” On finding “Estius” thus singled out from “other divines”, I could hardly suppose that he was in low estimation with Dr Wiseman. I certainly did not anticipate that he would be afterwards described, by that learned person, as “poor Estius.” But so it is; and if, as Dr Wiseman affirms, “I have made much of him, exalting him from time to time into something great”—I can truly declare, that Dr Wiseman has made very little of him, assiduously depressing him into something extremely small indeed. Throughout the *Reply*, we find the most agreeably ironical expressions, with reference to Estius; as well as to all those who are so uninformed as to quote *Him*, as possessing anything like authority in the Infallible Church.

My quotations from Estius, however—that is, from a writer whom Dr Wiseman had himself quoted, as a warrant for his own opinion—are not passed over with mere ridicule. Great and numerous as are my offences, the use I made of Estius appears to be deemed one of the very

greatest; and accordingly, regular evidence is adduced in p. 70 of the *Reply*—and supposing that might not be sufficient, again in p. 198—to show that Estius was not the considerable person I believed him to be. The evidence in each case is to much the same effect. I shall only trouble the reader with that given p. 70:

“Dr Turton seems to have got hold of one Catholic commentator, whom he is determined to make me accept as a great authority. This is Estius, whom he several times quotes; once as ‘a commentator of great name in the Roman Church.’ The professor will allow me to set him right upon this point. The commentary of Estius upon St Paul’s Epistles is highly esteemed by us, as one of the best upon that difficult portion of Scripture; but his commentaries upon other parts of the sacred volume are in no sort of repute. Calmet, a good testimony of Catholic opinion, made very small account of them: and Richard Simon, who devotes eight pages to the commentary on the Epistles, does not say one word upon his commentary on the rest of Scripture. Were any one, versed in Catholic studies, asked what commentators on the Gospels are most in use, and most generally recommended amongst us, I think he would unhesitatingly say, Maldonatus, Cornelius à Lapide, and Calmet.”

Although I have already stated how I “got hold of one Roman Catholic commentator,” I will observe, in the first place, that I perceived that Dr Wiseman had quoted Estius, and did not perceive that he had quoted any one of the commentators, Maldonatus, Cornelius à Lapide, Calmet;—secondly, that even from the foregoing account of Estius, he must have been a considerable man;—and thirdly, that in all my references to Estius—

and, Dr Wiseman says, I have referred to him again and again—I only *once* referred to “his Commentary on the rest of Scripture”—and that once, on an incidental point, unconnected with controversies between Roman Catholics and Protestants. With that exception, my quotations from Estius are taken from his work *On the Sentences*—the very work to which, as I stated in p. 15, Dr Wiseman had referred his readers, as authority for his own opinion.

What, it may be asked, is *the cause* of that extreme aversion, now shown on the part of Dr Wiseman, to Estius—the writer whom he had before adduced, in relation to the 6th chapter of St John? The only cause, which, I believe, can be assigned, is this—that, although Estius interprets that chapter, of the Eucharist, he does so in a manner which, if right, proves that Dr Wiseman’s method of interpretation is altogether wrong. In short, Estius adopts that more usual, and more simple, exposition on Roman Catholic principles—upon which, without giving it my assent, I have endeavoured to bestow due praise. There is, however, one strong objection to this my account of the matter. I have at least made as much use of the Rhemish Annotations on the New Testament, as of Estius; and the latter is not more opposed than the former, to Dr Wiseman’s mode of explaining the sixth chapter of St John—how is it, then, that he does not meet the Rhemish

Annotators, as in the case of Estius, with grave objections—with happy raillery—with substantial evidence of their want of weight? My reply is, that he might be apprehensive that the mode of proceeding, which did very well with regard to Estius, might not be held quite respectful towards what is generally considered as a kind of authorised commentary, on the New Testament, for the use of the Roman Catholic inhabitants of these realms.

5. “In delivering theological instruction”—Dr Wiseman writes, (*Reply*, p. 4)—“in proclaiming Catholic dogma from the pulpit, in private conferences, I had unaffectedly avoided all harsh expressions, as well as rancour of mind; and this long before I presented myself as a controversial writer before the English public. This tone I naturally preserved in the works which I published in London.” Now a work, like the Lectures on the Eucharist, from which all intemperance of expression was thus jealously excluded, ought certainly to bear any test which the learned author would think of applying to the productions of another person. In his *Reply*, he has taken, from my volume, a number of unconnected sentences and printed them consecutively, as a criterion of the character of the whole. Let therefore Dr Wiseman’s Lectures on the Eucharist be tried by his own test.

“Between the two opposite opinions of the literal and the figurative meaning of Christ’s expressions—there arose a middle system, which pretended to hold both, and reconcile the true receiving of our Lord’s body, with the fact of its not being there. This required a boldness unparalleled perhaps in the annals of interpretation, except among those Arians of old, who would call Christ the Son of God, yet not allow him to be consubstantial to the Father.” p. 15.

“From the latter [Reformers], unfortunately, the Church of England learnt her belief; and accordingly we find it fraught with the contradictions which it necessarily involves.” p. 16.

“The [English] Catechism stands in the same form of uncertain contradiction.” p. 18.

“At the end of the Communion Service [of the Church of England] there is at present a declaration, which runs more like a magistrate’s warrant, than an ecclesiastical definition; that no adoration is intended by the act of kneeling to receive the Lord’s supper.” p. 18.

“I will introduce the objection by the words of an adversary; which will serve to show, how correct principles may be perversely or ignorantly brought to produce false conclusions.” p. 75.

“While Mr T. thus refers to imaginary passages which no where exist.....and while Dr Lightfoot, as you will see later, endeavours, but feebly, to supply some such [sense], more learned or more candid Protestants acknowledge, &c.” p. 77.

“I presume I shall not be expected to examine the ridiculous passage given by Meuschen.” p. 78.

“My answer to this daring and unproved assertion is contained, &c.” p. 136.

“I must omit the exhibition of the laboured and lengthy, and often not very intelligible, paraphrases, by which they are compelled to explain our Saviour’s expressions.” p. 145.

“I will conclude this subject by quoting the opinions of a late Protestant philosopher in our country, who was probably as deep a divine as the Church of England has lately possessed; but who unfortunately betrays, where occasion

occurs, as miserable an ignorance of our religion, and as narrow a prejudice against it, as would have disgraced talents of a much lower order." p. 147.

"I could occupy you long by extracts from Protestants, full of the most ribald scurrility, when speaking of this blessed institution. But considering them, as we must do, at least ignorantly blasphemous, I will not shock your ears, nor pollute my lips, by repeating what can in no manner strengthen their case with virtuous or sensible men." p. 162.

"There is much to remark in this statement. One does not know, after reading it, whether to consider the writer a mad enthusiast, or little better than an idiot." p. 189.

"This exemplification is quite trite, and to be found in almost every Protestant writer. Mr T. brings it forward with great pomp, and seems quite satisfied of its sufficiency." p. 226.

"And this is the Syriac language, of which Dr Clarke has the hardihood to assert, &c." p. 237.

All that is intended to be shown, by the preceding series of sentences, is this—that, notwithstanding Dr Wiseman's great care, his own work is by no means free from those faults which he has taken so much pains to exhibit in mine.

6. With the explanations afforded by this introductory section, I should be quite satisfied, if my volume on the Eucharist were carefully read, along with Dr Wiseman's *Reply*. Almost any work grounded on truth will be found, when thoroughly examined, fully sufficient to vindicate itself from objections; and I should be sorry to attempt to defend any work of mine, which had been pronounced, after such an examination, to be erroneous. As few, however, have either time or inclination

for the kind of examination here alluded to, I have endeavoured, in the following sections, to enable the reader to form some judgement of the points in dispute between Dr Wiseman and myself.

Dr Wiseman expresses himself as if he were well pleased with his *Reply*. What the value of these Observations will be, I know not. Care will be taken that they shall not mislead the reader....The learned Lecturer intimates that he has but little leisure for contentions of this kind; and that is precisely my own case. Dr Wiseman has already vindicated his own work; and when these Observations are published, I shall have vindicated mine. We shall, both of us, very probably, have then written more, on the subject, than the world will be willing to read; and therefore we may both take the hint, and quietly withdraw from the contest.

SECTION II.

STRUCTURE OF THE SIXTH CHAPTER OF ST JOHN.

1. IT is well known that many Protestants agree in the main with a great majority of Roman Catholics, in their explanation of our Lord's discourse, in the sixth chapter of St John, till they come to the 51st verse. The two parties agree also in thinking that at that verse a change of subject takes place—a reference to the Eucharist being then introduced; but they differ as to the mode in which the reference to the Eucharist is to be understood. Dr Wiseman, in his Lectures, wished to transfer the change of subject from the 51st verse to the 48th; or, in other words, to prove that the change of subject is made between the 47th and 48th verses. The learned author complains, in his *Reply*, that all this was not made sufficiently clear to my readers; and seems to attribute the want of clearness to the arts of controversy. What advantage I could gain, by any concealment of this kind, is beyond my comprehension. If there really was any want of explicit statement, it must have arisen from an endeavour to guard against an unfair judgement—by examining the question, in

the first instance, without reference to theological opinions. Dr Wiseman, however, holds that my object was, to give a degree of importance to his conjecture, respecting the change at the 48th verse, which was by no means warranted by any expressions of his. To say the truth, I then thought, as I still think, that the conjecture was—to use my own phrase at the time—“remarkably ingenious”—by far the most striking portion of the first Lecture—the only portion, indeed, that seemed to require a distinct examination. Dr Wiseman, however, views the matter in a different light. “No where,” he writes, p. 32, of his *Reply*,” does Dr T. give better proof of his controversial talent of treating secondary and unimportant points as of great magnitude, than in his lengthened commentary of nearly forty pages upon a short text of seven. Not only from his diffuseness but still more from his earnestness, the reader is led to suppose that my opinion upon this subject is something perfectly monstrous, and that its confutation will overthrow the rest of my argument.” As for the remark upon my “commentary of nearly forty pages” upon Dr Wiseman’s “short text of seven”—these points are not to be decided, I take it, by *the rule of three*. A man may, in less than seven pages, make mistakes which may require more than forty pages for their rectification. But let that pass. The learned author devotes page 34 of his *Reply* to

“an historical sketch” of his speculations on the subject; in proof that I could have no good reason for making his proposed division of the chapter a thing of consequence. Now, whatever arts of controversy he may assign to me, he does not imagine, I suppose, that I possess the arts of divination—and therefore I shall not farther notice his “historical sketch;” but of the importance, which Dr Wiseman, in his Lectures, really appeared to attach to his proposed division, I shall now enable the reader to judge, by the following extracts from the lectures themselves :

“The point at issue, therefore, between us and our adversaries, is two-fold. First, is there a change of subject at the 48th verse; secondly, is the transition, &c?” (p. 40.)

“It will appear from what I have said, that I am not satisfied with the transition being placed, as it usually is, at the 51st verse. Before closing this lecture, therefore, it is proper that I clear up this point; the more so, as the determination of such a transition *must materially advance* the strength of the arguments which I shall bring forward. For if it shall be shown, that the portion comprised between the 48th and 52nd verses is a complete section of itself, we shall not unreasonably conclude that a new subject may likewise be therein treated. I have no hesitation in placing the transition at the 48th verse.” (pp. 40, 41).

“The motive which principally induces me to see a clear separation between vv. 47 and 48, and which forbids me to allow any other transition or break in the discourse, till its complete interruption at v. 53, is the connexion of the entire passage in what is known by the name of the *poetical parallelism.*” (p. 43).

“This attempt to prove, I trust not unsuccessfully, that there is a marked division of the discourse, at verse the 48th, is not, as I have before observed, of mean im-

portance in our researches. It removes an objection made *in limine* by our adversaries, that it is doing a violence to our Saviour's discourse, to suppose that he passes from one subject to another where there is nothing to indicate such a transition. I have shown that the structure of this portion of the passage detaches it from the preceding; and my next lectures will demonstrate the remarkable change of phraseology which takes place at the same time." (p. 45).

"Such are the grounds which I conceive not merely authorise, but convincingly oblige us to suppose a transition to a new section of our Lord's discourse at the 48th verse." (p. 47).

If the five extracts just given, from Dr Wiseman's "seven pages of text"—not to mention repeated allusions, to the same subject, through the subsequent Lectures—fail to prove *the importance* of the proposed division in Dr Wiseman's estimation at that time, and to indicate the mode in which he was *labouring* to establish his conjecture, I really know not what *is* proof. In his *Reply* however, besides what I have already quoted, he states, (p. 36)—so completely nugatory does he now deem his proposed division at v. 48—"that, in fact, he might have cut out every word of the seven pages in question, without any loss, except of forty pages in Dr Turton's book." Dr Wiseman, as I have all along held, is a man of learning and talent. The reader of these pages will henceforth maintain that he is a man of singular intrepidity of assertion.

There is something yet to be remarked on the division at v. 48; and, for the sake of clearness, the reader must be informed, that Dr Wise-

man published, much about the same time, not only his Lectures on the Eucharist, but also two volumes of "Lectures on the principal doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church—delivered at St Mary's Moorfields, during the Lent of 1836." I used these last named Lectures, as supplementary to the former, or as explanatory of them; quoting them, for the purpose of briefly distinguishing them from the College Lectures, as "Discourses." Dr Wiseman calls them "Moorfields Lectures;" and thus reproves one of my delinquencies, with regard to them:

"Dr T. in his preface, promises 'incidental references' to my 'Moorfields Lectures:—fairness would have recommended such a reference on this occasion. For his readers would have come to a very different conclusion from himself, on the importance I attach to the place of division, had they been told that, in those Lectures, I stated the question to be '*immaterial*, it makes no difference whether we place it one verse earlier or later,' (Vol. II. p. 142); that I afterwards speak of the transition having already taken place at v. 51, where most Catholics place it; and that, at p. 140, I vaguely fix it 'about the 50th verse.' And yet nearly every one of the arguments in the larger Lectures is presented in these. How could I, therefore, be supposed to have built them upon my division of the text?" (*Reply*, p. 35).

Now, on the one hand, we read in the larger Lectures (p. 41), that "the determination of such a transition," namely at the 48th verse, "*must materially advance* the strength of the arguments" to be brought forward—the same sentiment being there asserted or implied, again and again: on the

other hand, the Moorfields Lectures state that the determination is "*immaterial*;" and Dr Wiseman now holds that it is *immaterial*. He who can reconcile these contradictions must have made great advances in that department of intellectual exercise. Having no talents in that way, I did what appeared to be the best, in the emergency. When examining the principles of the proposed division, I wrote of the division, as if it were deemed important; and I could not have done otherwise, as I continually quoted the learned author's own words. When proceeding to trace its application, I avowed my opinion of its nugatory character, in terms almost as strong as the learned author now employs with regard to it.

There is not, I will venture to say, a single person, who, in reading these pages for the first time, is not thoroughly convinced, from Dr Wiseman's language, that I never hinted at the expression used in the Moorfields Lectures. And yet, in the 58th page of my volume, I thus wrote: "It may be enough to say, that the reasons for dividing the discourse after the 47th verse being completely inefficient—and the author himself allowing as he does, with strange inconsistency, the point of division to be "*immaterial*" (Discourses, Vol. II. p. 142)—I shall henceforward, with the acknowledged concurrence of Roman Catholic and Protestant writers, consider the first part of the discourse as continued to the 51st verse." Let

the reader advert once more to the paragraph from the *Reply* given in p. 26, and decide whether any other conclusion, as to my not having quoted the Moorfields Lectures, can be fairly drawn. Let him also adopt the term "strange inconsistency," or supply another, of greater or of less intensity, according to his own fancy.

There is a corollary, resulting from all this, which I will here put down. By means of the paragraph last quoted from the *Reply*, Dr Wiseman has given the Moorfields Lectures a co-ordinate authority with the Lectures on the Eucharist. It is a useful corollary; and I hope the reader will take the trouble to bear it in mind for a little space.

2. Dr Wiseman's proposed division of our Lord's discourse being of no importance, I should not now notice his reasons for the division, if it were not that the learned author has recorded some complaints against me, with regard to those reasons. I will briefly state the points alluded to; and I wish I could promise that my brevity will not in any instance lead to obscurity.

(1) Dr Wiseman's first reason for dividing the discourse immediately after the 47th verse was thus given, in the Lectures on the Eucharist, p. 41; except that, in accordance with our English version, I shall here, and elsewhere, substitute *Verily* for *Amen*:

“Verse 47 seems to me to form an appropriate close to a division of discourse, by the emphatic asseveration *Verily*, prefixed to a manifest summary and epilogue of all the preceding doctrine. ‘Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth in me hath everlasting life.’ Compare vv. 35, 37, 45. Verse 48 lays down a clear proposition: ‘I am the bread of life:’ suggested by the preceding words, and just suited for the opening of a new discourse.”

Here was an assumption, which, although unsupported by evidence, appeared to involve this principle—namely, that *Verily, verily*, was usually prefixed to a summary and epilogue of what had gone before. On turning to St John’s Gospel, I found five instances, in succession, of *Verily, verily*, being prefixed to a re-commencement, a continuation of discourse. These were sufficient to prove the incorrectness of Dr Wiseman’s assumption; but had time allowed I should have pursued my researches—and have drawn a conclusion—not, as I hastily did, from the five instances just mentioned—but in conformity with all the cases which the Gospels might have presented. From some passages collected by Dr Wiseman (*Reply*, p. 43, &c.), it appears that the expression, *Verily, verily*, is used at the commencement, and also at the conclusion of a discourse—as well as for the purpose of continuing and re-enforcing the precepts and admonitions already given. In adducing such passages, the learned author has acted very properly. I think this the best part of his *Reply*; and I willingly avail myself of what is thus

offered. Whatever passages show that the expression is used in commencing and continuing a discourse, tend so far to show that John vi. 47 *may* be the commencement of a new paragraph, and not, as Dr Wiseman contends, the close of the preceding one. But the truth is, that, amidst such diversity in the usage of the expression, nothing can be concluded, as to the point at issue, from the general analogy of other passages.

(2) We now proceed to Dr Wiseman's second reason for his proposed division. Our Lord in his discourse, John vi. 35, uses the expression, *I am the bread of life*; and again, John vi. 48, the same words. Dr Wiseman (Lectures, p. 41) found it "an ordinary form of transition" with our Lord, "when he applies the same images to different purposes, to repeat the very words by which he originally commenced his discourse." The learned author gave, as instances, John x. 11—16; where the 11th and 14th verses begin, *I am the good shepherd*—and John xv. 1—8; where the first verse begins, *I am the true vine*, and the 5th verse, *I am the vine*—which, although not quite the same with the former, may be allowed to be as nearly the same as the occasion requires. In the former of those passages, Dr Wiseman supposed that John x. 11—13 regarded *our Lord himself*; and that John x. 14—16 referred to *the sheep*. I gave my reasons for thinking that John x. 14—16 regarded *our Lord himself* even more

than John x. 11—13 regarded him. There was a similar discrepancy of opinion between us, in the case of John xv. 1—8. The fact, in each instance, was, that Dr Wiseman, perceiving clearly enough that certain important words rendered the alleged passage altogether adverse to the purpose for which it was wanted, considered such words “as merely incidental and parenthetic.” I condemned the attempt thus to get rid of words immediately affecting the decision of the point under consideration; and endeavoured to show the meaning of the passage, supposing the words *not* to be “merely incidental and parenthetic.” Dr Wiseman employs about six pages of his *Reply* (pp. 49—55). in proving that an important declaration *may* be introduced “incidentally and parenthetically”—and refers to Bishop Porteus, Woide, Cramer, Michaelis and Marsh, as his authorities. All this is quite beside the mark. No one can doubt that important sentiments are occasionally so introduced. The real question is, whether passages, requiring the management above described, can be properly adduced as *proof*-passages. Assuredly, what is thus brought forward, for the sake of illustration, ought to be as clear as the noon-day. We cannot therefore but conclude that, when the passages had been subjected to Dr Wiseman’s treatment, they became perfectly worthless, as evidences in his own cause. In fine, setting aside the previous improbability—that our Lord’s discourses were so

systematically constructed, that a peculiarity, like the one imagined by Dr Wiseman, can be predicated of them in general—his attempt at proof is liable to these objections:—two instances, even if indisputably clear, are insufficient to establish a rule;—Dr Wiseman's two instances are *not* indisputably clear, inasmuch as, before they can be of any avail, they must be expressly adapted to the purpose he has in view.

In explanation of John xv. 1—8, I wrote, p. 23, “The reasoning is of this kind—‘He that believeth in me—bringeth forth much fruit—and *only in that case*—for without me ye can do nothing’.” Upon this, Dr Wiseman remarks in his *Reply*, p. 54. “After all, Dr Turton supposes an ellipsis of the words, *and only in that case*, and intrudes them into the text, which is a much greater conjectural liberty than I have taken.” On another occasion (Lectures, p. 125) Dr Wiseman thus expressed himself: “We must, therefore, consider the appeal to his ascension, in the 6th chapter of St John, in precisely the same light; and may fill up the apodosis of his sentence, by, *would you not receive my word after such a confirmation.*” Now, I do not recollect that *I* ever said that Dr Wiseman “intruded” *his words* “into the text.”

(3) The third reason, alleged by the learned author, is “the motive which principally induced him to see a clear separation between v. 47

and v. 48 (John vi.) and which forbade him to allow any other separation or break in the discourse, till its complete interruption at v. 53"—that is "poetical parallelism." Dr Wiseman, in his *Reply* p. 56, pronounces my "attack" upon this reason to be "as feeble as it is boastful." He did not, he says, apply this "poetical parallelism" to "the interpretation of Scripture"; but as he deemed the division, which it was intended to support, calculated "materially to advance the strength of his arguments", I supposed that it must have at least some bearing upon "the interpretation of Scripture." If I had, he subjoins, "looked farther into Dr Jebb, I should have found plenty of instances where, in stichometrical compositions, verses are not complete sentences":—not often so incomplete, I should hope, as the proposed sentences, in Dr Wiseman's Lectures. He concludes the matter by quoting my opinion—that "a much better distribution of his materials might have been made"; in which I do not think there is much boasting.

3. To remove an objection to the supposition of a transition from one subject to another, at John vi. 48, Dr Wiseman finally referred (Lectures, p. 45) to "a perfectly parallel instance of such a transition", at Matt. xxiv. 43; and this reference led to a variety of considerations, which must now be discussed.

A few pages back, namely from p. 26, to p. 28, it was seen that I had to encounter the reprehension of Dr Wiseman, for not having duly attended to the Moorfields Lectures. The impropriety of my proceeding was evinced by means of "an historical sketch"; and the corollary, which I ventured to draw, was inevitable—that the Moorfields Lectures were to be accounted of co-ordinate authority, at the least, with the Lectures on the Eucharist. But now, the scene is changed. I am reprovèd for noticing the Moorfields Lectures at all; and the new conclusion seems to be, that the said Moorfields Lectures were published only to be disregarded. I am also accused of not having duly referred to the Moorfields Lectures, when I quoted them. In short, the learned author (*Reply*, p. 62) writes as follows: "There is a most unworthy breach of candour, in thus transferring his attack from the work under consideration [Lectures on the Eucharist], to another [Moorfields Lectures]; without either, by a reference or otherwise at this place, directing the reader's attention to the stratagem, but leaving him to surmise, as probably many did, that the words quoted were the arguments of the *Lectures on the Eucharist*. These, in fact, are the later, and avowedly the more studied performance; and any departure in them from the more popular and previous work, should, in fairness, be considered as the writer's true

opinion; and *this* should have been attacked." Be it recollected that, in the *Reply*, p. 35, the learned author wrote as follows:—"Dr T. in his preface, promises 'incidental references' to my 'Moorfields Lectures':—fairness would have recommended such a reference on this occasion. For, his readers would have come to a very different conclusion from himself on the importance I attach to the place of division, had they been told, that, in those Lectures, I stated the question to be *immaterial*, &c. &c." At the risk of being considered by Dr Wiseman as about to revert to some of my old forms of speech, I *will* say that it would be difficult to find another volume presenting, in less than thirty pages, two passages like those which I have now placed in juxta-position.

But I have not yet done with the passage which mentions "the stratagem" to which I have had recourse, in not referring to the Moorfields Lectures. The reader must either take the trouble to refer to the 33rd page of my volume on the Eucharist, and there read for himself—or believe me when I affirm that he there *may* read—the following words: "In the last extract from the *Lectures*, we find the learned author asserting that 'some of the best commentators'—meaning, as he elsewhere informs us, 'exclusively Protestant commentators'—place the point of separation [in St Matthew] at the 43rd verse. In

his *Discourses*, he adopts still stronger language: ‘All the most accurate commentators’, he there says, ‘place the point of separation at the 43rd verse of the 24th chapter.’” In this manner did I refer to the Moorfields Lectures—giving, in a note, the place referred to, thus:—Discourses, Vol. II. p. 143. I have already stated that I called the Moorfields Lectures—Discourses. On what principles all these strange proceedings, on the part of Dr Wiseman, are to be accounted for—I do not pretend to suggest. Let the reader ponder on the subject for himself. I will not disturb the current of his thoughts by any observations of my own.

Having disposed, as well as circumstances would permit, of the “stratagem” which Dr Wiseman thought proper to attribute to me, in concealing my reference to the Moorfields Lectures, I now proceed to lay before the reader what the learned author is pleased to denominate a “clever manœuvre” on my part. With reference to the transition, in the 24th chapter of St Matthew, which has been alluded to, Dr Wiseman (Lectures, p. 46) thus wrote: “Now where does the transition occur? Why, some of the best commentators, as Kuinoel, and after him Bloomfield, place it at the 43rd verse.” The question is, whether Dr W. referred, or must be supposed to have referred, to Kuinoel and Bloomfield *only*—or to “some of the best commentators” *besides*? Even had the

explanatory Moorfields Lectures been unknown to me, I honestly confess that I should have concluded that "some of the best commentators", as well as *the two* specified, were referred to. Thus however, in his *Reply*, (p. 62), Dr Wiseman reasons and represents things: "If here"—that is, in the Lectures—"I considered it sufficient for my argument, that *two* Protestant commentators should have maintained an opinion, the argument should not have been treated as depending upon the fact of *a great number* maintaining or rejecting that opinion. Yet so has Dr T. treated it; and, to borrow his own phrase, 'the scheme was ingenious'. It allowed him to display a great many neutral forces, as on his side; and under their cover to execute his clever manœuvre of shifting the ground of controversy."—Let us consider Dr Wiseman's own mode of viewing the matter. We will even suppose that, without the slightest allusion to "some of the best commentators", he had simply mentioned Kuinoel and Bloomfield, as holding a particular opinion. "If *I*," says Dr Wiseman, "considered it sufficient for MY argument, that *two* commentators should have maintained an opinion, the argument should not have been treated as depending upon the fact of *a great number* maintaining or rejecting that opinion:"—which, in brief, runs thus—"What *I* have considered sufficient, that is enough:—let not others venture to put forth a dif-

ferent opinion." Has, then, Dr Wiseman been appointed Dictator? Why may not any man who pleases refer to *a great number* of commentators? What right has Dr Wiseman to fix limits to investigation; and say to his reader, "Hitherto shalt thou go, and no farther"? Whence his authority for assigning *the number* of commentators to be consulted—for deciding that there shall be but *two*—and for declaring *who* they shall be? And if any one ventures to step beyond the line, which Dr Wiseman at his own mere will has drawn, on what ground is that person to be denounced, as having practised a "stratagem"—as having executed a "clever manœuvre"? So much for the general principle—that Dr Wiseman's judgement is to be the standard of what is right.—But, to advert to the particular case—Was it really "sufficient for his argument that *two* commentators should have maintained the opinion?" No. The argument was *of no value whatever*, unless there was a general consent of commentators in that opinion; and therefore I was perfectly right, in "treating the argument, as depending upon the fact of *a great number* maintaining, or rejecting that opinion." I also affirm that I did not *then* "shift the ground of controversy", as stated by Dr Wiseman; and that Dr Wiseman has himself *now* "shifted the ground of controversy". The argument, so far as I could then understand it, was this—that a certain division, in the 6th chapter of St John,

was sanctioned by *the general agreement* of commentators, as to a similar division in the 24th chapter of St Matthew; and I once more affirm that, till that general agreement is proved—which can only be done by examining *a great number* of commentators—the argument is good for nothing. Dr Wiseman, indeed, knew very well how completely his argument depended upon the general agreement of commentators, when he told his Moorfields audience, that “all the most accurate commentators” placed the division at the verse he indicated.

All that is contained in the preceding paragraph may be urged on the supposition that only two commentators were referred to; but let the learned author be again heard in proof of that point:

“My words are these: ‘Why, some of the best commentators, as Kuinoel, and after him Bloomfield, place it at the 43rd verse.’ I conceive that the *some* are thus significantly specified. Were I to write, ‘Some of the best historians, as Lingard and Capefigue, believe the massacre of St Bartholomew to have been accidental’, surely it would be a strange way of proving my assertion inaccurate, to refer to the other historians who thought otherwise. My reference to names would sufficiently explain who the historians were that I meant.” *Reply*, p. 60. note.

The author of the foregoing representation would assuredly be very indignant, if any one were to suppose him unacquainted with the fallacies which it involves. In the first place, Dr Wiseman does not inform us *what use is to be*

made of this supposed reference to “some of the best historians, as Lingard and Capefigue.” If the two historians thus specified are adduced as sufficient authorities for our believing that the massacre of St Bartholomew was accidental—such accidental massacre being subsequently employed, in argument, *as a fact*—it becomes the duty of every one, who regards truth, to extend his inquiries among “some of the best historians,” for the purpose of ascertaining what kind of tale *they* have to tell. In the second place, he assumes that the only proper object, which a man can have in the matter, is to convince himself that the opinions of Lingard and Capefigue are accurately reported; and thereby assumes the point at issue—namely, that “some of the best historians” are, by the very turn of expression excluded from the inquiry.... Let us, however, place the subject in another point of view. Suppose some one to be dissatisfied with Lingard and Capefigue, as authorities respecting the origin of the massacre; and to maintain, from Dr Wiseman’s mode of expression, that he had no other authorities to produce. Suppose also Dr Wiseman, in the course of his researches to meet with certain other historians of good repute, who agree with Lingard and Capefigue on the point. Are there any terms of ridicule and invective, which the learned author would hesitate to apply to the person who could so misinterpret his expression, as to imagine that

he meant to exclude "the best historians", with the exception of Lingard and Capefigue—or, in other words, that Lingard and Capefigue were any otherwise specified, than as *representatives* of "some of the best historians"? It is indeed greatly to be lamented that Dr Wiseman's talents should be thus employed in involving what is plain in utter perplexity.—With regard to the massacre of St Bartholomew, I will only observe, that it was an awkward event to happen by accident.

In repelling the charge of "stratagem" and "manœuvre" brought against me by Dr Wiseman, and showing that the notion, of his referring solely to Kuinoel and Bloomfield, is a mere after-thought, formed to meet an unexpected difficulty—I am, in fact, supporting the credit of that gentleman's writings—against which he has, with his own hand, dealt a deadly blow. For, what are the circumstances of the case? In the same month of August 1836, Dr Wiseman published his Lectures on the Eucharist; that is, as we learn from the preface, "a portion of the theological course several times delivered in the English College at Rome"—and his Moorfields Lectures; that is, discourses delivered during the Lent of that year to a mixed audience. These Moorfields Lectures, originally taken down in short hand, were afterwards published, "with many notes and details," by the Lecturer himself. We have seen (p. 26), that in one instance Dr Wiseman insisted

upon the Moorfields Lectures being considered as explanatory of the College Lectures. In the (College) Lectures on the Eucharist, Dr Wiseman stated that "some of the best commentators, as Kuinoel and after him Bloomfield"—meaning, as he *now* asserts, Kuinoel and Bloomfield *only*—held a certain opinion. In the Moorfields Lectures, after mentioning, in relation to the point in question, "most modern Protestant commentators" and "all those whom he had read"—Dr Wiseman declared that "all the most accurate commentators" held the very same opinion. Now, if Dr Wiseman's assertion be correct—that he meant *only* Kuinoel and Bloomfield—by divulging that fact, he has gone very far indeed towards destroying the credit of the Moorfields Lectures. What security is there that misrepresentations equally gross may not pervade them from beginning to end?

On commencing my references to commentators, respecting the alleged division at Matt. xxiv. 43, I did not at all anticipate the result at which I was to arrive. It seemed strange indeed, on inspecting the passage, that commentators should have fixed the division exactly there; and I was really desirous of seeing their reasons for so doing. After examining various commentators, and finding no traces of a division at that verse—except in a very few instances, which I carefully recorded—I consulted several editions, and several versions, of the Greek Testament, in which great attention

had been bestowed upon the marking of the divisions—and in none of them could I find any intimations of the division in question. These circumstances excited unpleasant feelings respecting the object of Dr Wiseman's labours; and, I believe, gave a severer character to my remarks than they would otherwise have exhibited. I cannot, indeed, but think my plan of inquiry perfectly fair. If the reference to editions, versions and commentators had been favourable to Dr Wiseman's views, he would not, I conclude, have deemed the proceeding wrong. He may lament that such reference was not favourable; but he ought not to condemn me for appealing to any other commentators than the two specified.

Lament, did I say? Why, Dr Wiseman is quite delighted with the reference. For in p. 63 of the *Reply*, he thus writes:

“After this protest against Dr T's unhandsome and uncandid dealing [in the affair of the “clever manœuvre”], I ask, what has he gained by it? He has quoted me thirteen Protestant commentators, who place the transition at v. 42, instead of at v. 43. Most heartily do I thank him for his diligence and sagacity. My object was merely to prove that Protestant commentators are not deterred from placing transitions in our Lord's discourses by the coherence of sentences before and after; and I quoted *two* authorities. Dr T. has the kindness to favour me with *thirteen* instead; who, though they place the transition a verse earlier than my two, do yet precisely the same thing—they place a transition where the expression indicates a close connexion with what precedes. He has, therefore, made my answer to the objection stronger, in the proportion of 13 to 2.”

It seems, then, that a paragraph beginning with the 42nd verse will do just as well for Dr Wiseman, as a paragraph beginning with the 43rd verse. "My object," he writes, "was *merely* to prove that Protestant commentators are not deterred from placing transitions in our Lord's discourses by the coherence of sentences before and after." Gently. Verse 47, of John vi, was represented (Lectures, p. 41,) as "an appropriate close to a division of discourse"—"a manifest *summary and epilogue* of all the preceding doctrine." Moreover, the 43rd verse, of Matt. xxiv, was given (pp. 45, 46) as "a perfectly parallel instance"—"In the preceding verse (41), our Lord *sums up* the substance of the foregoing instruction, just as he does in John vi. 47." Dr Wiseman's object therefore, as stated in his Lectures, is not *merely* what he has stated in his *Reply*. Moreover, if commentators are in favour of a division at the 42nd verse in St Matthew, how is that "a perfectly parallel instance" to the learned author's proposed division at the 48th verse in St John? Is it the same, in this respect, whether the division be at the 42nd or the 43rd verse?

We have finally to advert to the two specified commentators, Kuinoel and Bloomfield..... Kuinoel had made a division between the 42nd and 43rd verses of Matt. xxiv., as Dr Wiseman had truly stated. Thinking Kuinoel's reasons for such a division very insufficient, I frankly de-

clared my opinion; which Dr Wiseman (*Reply*, p. 65) holds to be an extraordinary proceeding on my part. The learned author concludes a page of comment on this subject, with the remark, "I need hardly remind the reader again, that I am no ways interested in the accuracy of his [Kuinoel's] opinion, but only in the fact of his maintaining it." When examining the Lectures on the Eucharist, I frequently met with passages so different from what I had been accustomed to find in theological discussions, that I paused again and again, to ask myself—What is Dr Wiseman's purpose? does he intend to prove a doctrine to be true, or to support it, at all events? The sentence which I have just transcribed from the *Reply* calls forth the same inquiry. "I am," Dr Wiseman writes, "no ways interested in the accuracy of Kuinoel's opinion." Let the reader observe the bearing of this sentence. Why will Dr Wiseman lead us to suppose that he is ready to avail himself of any opinion, of any commentator, provided that he can build an argument upon it in favour of his own tenets?

With regard to Bloomfield, I concluded (p. 45) that, when he wrote the note referred to in his *Recensio Synoptica*, "he was not considering the exact point of transition; for he not only quotes Kuinoel and Rosenmüller as agreeing in opinion on the subject, when in fact they do not so agree, but transcribes the manifestly different

sentiments of Doddridge [who had placed the division after the 41st verse] in confirmation of the same views." I also stated that Dr Bloomfield, in his Greek Testament subsequently published (1832), had described "some of the best commentators ancient and modern," as agreeing in drawing the line after the 41st verse. The first of these reasons—for thinking that Bloomfield's account of the matter, in his *Recensio Synoptica*, is not fully to be relied upon—Dr Wiseman calls "a conjecture"; and the second he despatches, by remarking, that it is "drawn from another work subsequently published." The learned author concludes with suggesting that "the mass of errors", which I had mentioned as belonging to this part of the Lectures, "is in my commentary, and not in the text." Dr Wiseman having been "no ways interested in the accuracy of Kuinoel's opinion", he is, I conclude, in the same predicament with regard to that of Bloomfield; and therefore it can be of no consequence, to the learned author, whether or not Dr Bloomfield's opinion was inadvertently formed—and whether or not he afterwards corrected that opinion. If I do not mistake, Dr Wiseman has, by this mode of representing his views, inflicted as heavy a blow upon his Lectures on the Eucharist, as he formerly directed against his Moorfields Lectures.

Dr Wiseman describes "Bloomfield as unmercifully dealt with, for having been so unfortunate

as to afford him a reference." The reader will judge whether I did any thing more than attribute to Dr Bloomfield one of those oversights from which no man, who is engaged in a work of such extent as the *Recensio Synoptica*, can hope to escape.

When discussing my remarks on Kuinoel and Bloomfield, Dr Wiseman contrasts, with great effect, his own facility in admitting evidence, with my scrupulosity in that particular. "I bow", he writes, (p. 65) "to Dr Turton's superior sagacity; but when I referred to Kuinoel or any other author, to ascertain his opinion, I never made it a part of my plan to doubt his own record of it, or dive into his intentions".....and soon after, according to the sentence already quoted: "I need hardly remind the reader again, that I am no ways interested in the accuracy of his [Kuinoel's] opinion, but only in the fact of his maintaining it." The learned author here seems to have assigned the true reason for the difference which exists between us, in the matter under review. He is "no ways interested in the accuracy of the opinion" which he quotes; whereas I take the greatest care not to quote an opinion, which I have not good reason to believe to be accurate. Nevertheless, Dr Wiseman seizes an opportunity to write somewhat sharply, even of Kuinoel and Bloomfield (p. 93), before he has advanced far in his third Lecture—as the following extract will prove:

“Kuinoel has imagined a very pretty scene; for he has given us an account of the different sentiments which formed the dispute of the Jews, as accurately as a writer of romance could have done it. I am surprised that a sober English commentator, like Bloomfield, should have copied this fiction; for he ought to have been aware, that it is by this *psychological* method of interpretation, as it is called in Germany, or, in other words, by supplying from imagination facts and conversations supposed to have been omitted by the Evangelists, that such men as Paulus, Gabler, Schuster, and others of the Rationalist school, pretend to overthrow every miracle in the Gospels.”

From the preceding extract, as well as from other passages which I have had occasion to cite, it is clear that Dr Wiseman takes the liberty to bestow his censure upon those, to whom, as he supposes, censure is due; and that is all that I have done in the case of Kuinoel.....The case of Rosenmüller, who was referred to by Bloomfield, might here receive a brief notice; but as the main effect of such notice would be to show that there was *one* commentator, *not* fixing the division in St. Matthew at the 43rd verse, who had been carefully read by Dr Wiseman, I will not enlarge upon the subject.

4. The reader will recollect that the alleged division of the 24th chapter of St. Matthew was given by Dr Wiseman, as “a perfectly parallel instance” to the proposed division of the 6th chapter of St. John. Thinking it singular that commentators should have been referred to, by

Dr Wiseman, as authorities for the illustrative instance, and not for the case immediately under consideration, I expressed my surprise at the omission, in stronger terms probably than were called for. The learned author, in his *Reply* (pp. 71—77) has recourse to Maldonatus, Cornelius à Lapide and Calmet—Roman Catholic commentators, whom, as I have already recorded, he has commended very highly—and, in my opinion, very justly.

Respecting the first of those commentators, Dr Wiseman thus writes: “Maldonatus thinks, in common with some ancient writers, that, from the beginning of his discourse, our Saviour spoke of the Eucharist; but conjointly with faith and other means of being united with him; and afterwards passed to treat more specifically of the Blessed Sacrament.....Where, therefore, does he place the transition? He no where distinctly states it, but it seems to me probable that he places it nearly where I do.” Now, the division contended for by Dr Wiseman was just after the 47th verse—“the summary and epilogue of the preceding doctrine”; and therefore when it merely “seems probable” that Maldonatus “places” the division “nearly where” Dr Wiseman had himself placed it, he in other words admits that Maldonatus does *not* sanction the precise division proposed.

There is, however, one point, in connexion with Maldonatus, eminently deserving of atten-

tion. Dr Wiseman, in his Lectures, called *Verily, verily*, in v. 47, “an emphatic asseveration prefixed to a manifest summary and epilogue of all the preceding doctrine”—the part of the verse, subsequent to the “asseveration,” being that “summary and epilogue”. In his *Reply* (p. 72) his language is: “Maldonatus moreover considers v. 47 much in the same light that I do. I call it ‘an emphatic asseveration prefixed to a summary and epilogue of all the preceding doctrine:’ he considers it a return to the original proposition regarding faith, confirmed by an asseveration almost amounting to an oath.”...I know not whether the reader will have observed Dr Wiseman’s wonderful substitution of *the whole 47th verse* “as prefixed to a summary and epilogue” of preceding doctrine—instead of the *verily, verily*, as prefixed to the remaining part of the 47th verse. If I had not actually witnessed this substitution, I should have thought it “beyond the reach of art”. And by this substitution, Dr Wiseman intends to accommodate his plan of interpretation to that of Maldonatus; but how the 47th verse can be, at the same time, “a summary and epilogue”, according to Dr Wiseman’s primary notion—and “a return to the original proposition regarding faith”, according to Maldonatus—is not for me to explain. So far as I can understand the matter, the verse is retrospective in the one case, and prospective in the other. Nothing of this

kind, however, renders the substitution above mentioned less worthy of admiration.

The learned author's very just remark on Cornelius à Lapede might have been applied with equal propriety to Maldonatus. "On Cornelius à Lapede," Dr Wiseman writes, "there is little to say; for he considers our Saviour's discourse to refer to the Eucharist throughout."

Dr Wiseman extracts from Calmet the following passage, to prove that he is favourable to a division at the 48th verse:

"*Qui credit in me habet vitam aeternam.* Il rapelle ce qu'il a déjà dit ci-devant, v. 40, *celui qui croit au Fils, a la vie éternelle.* It est attiré par mon Père, *il a écouté ses instructions; il s'est nourri du pain de vie; il m'a été donné par mon Père; je ne le perdrai point, je le ressusciterai au dernier jour; il aura la vie éternelle.* Toutes vérités relatives, et liées les unes avec les autres, que le Sauveur a rebattues, et tournées en différentes dans tout ce discours, pour les inculquer davantage."

Dr Wiseman "confidently asks," as he says—"could Calmet have more clearly shown that he considered v. 47 in the same light that I do, as 'an epilogue and summary of the preceding discourse,' which he recapitulates member by member, as summed up in this verse?" On this I will only observe, that if the reader should find, in the passage from Calmet, more than might have been written without supposing a division—together with a complete change of subject—there, he will find more than I can.... Dr Wise-

man finally appeals to some of the ancient Fathers, in confirmation of his opinion. If my limits would allow, I would lay the passages before the reader, and leave him to form his own judgement on the subject.

I cannot close this section, without thanking Dr Wiseman for some hints, which, if I rightly understand them, warrant the conclusion, that the new *Version of the Gospels, by a Catholic*, must be assigned to Dr Lingard. I had not met with any one who could give me the information.

SECTION III.

HERMENEUTICAL PRINCIPLES—COUNCIL OF TRENT.

1. CONNECTING the Hermeneutical principles laid down in the first of the Lectures on the Eucharist, with Dr Wiseman's declaration—when opening the first of his Moorfields Lectures on the same subject—that it was “necessary to enter more fully into an exposition of a few general and simple principles, which have their foundation in the philosophy of ordinary language, and in common sense”—I expressed my distrust of principles thus brought forward for a particular purpose. A formal array of principles founded on the philosophy of ordinary language, &c.—principles reserved, as it were, for the occasion—appeared to me equivalent to a confession, that the usual modes of interpretation were insufficient for the object which was in view. A proceeding of this kind was so like to a desertion of the principles employed in other instances, that I called it by that name. If the reader should be of opinion that the use of such a term was scarcely warranted, by all means let a more appropriate one be substituted in its place.

2. In my volume on the Eucharist (p. 62), after intimating the difficulty of understanding a pretty long extract which had been given, I thus went on: "The learned writer begins with 'the meaning of a word or phrase'; and, if I rightly conjecture, glides without hesitation to the impression made by an entire address, or section of an address:—when it is clear that 'a word or phrase' might be understood by one who mistook the import of the sentence—and the sentence, by one who misapprehended the whole discourse." On this, Dr Wiseman remarks, in his *Reply*, (p. 89)—"There is not a word in the passage he quotes, to warrant any such assertion. I speak entirely of the impression of words: not a syllable do I say, about an entire address, or section of an address. If I had, I should have laid myself open to just censure, and a charge of inconsistency." Now, as Dr Wiseman *began* the extract with "the meaning of a word or phrase"—and ended it with this admonition—"Of course, when I speak of our Saviour's *discourses* being *understood*, I do not mean that they were comprehended"—my conclusion, which still seems inevitable, was—that, whatever might be the distinction between understanding and comprehending, Dr Wiseman really did, in some way or other, make a transition from "a word or phrase" to a "discourse"—an entire address, or section of an address. I will only add that,

if I failed in my endeavours to understand or comprehend the extract in question, my want of success was my misfortune and not my fault.— This, indeed, was a misfortune which appears to have been common to various learned and intelligent persons, who have published remarks upon Dr Wiseman's work.

3. Dr Wiseman having so far adhered to me with considerable steadiness, now diverges to *Philalethes Cantabrigiensis*, and the Council of Trent; but as I am not uninterested in the matter, my published sentiments with regard to it very much coinciding with those of *Philalethes*, I shall venture to interpose a few words on the topics brought forward. It is right to premise that Dr Wiseman, conceiving himself to have been animadverted upon by *Philalethes* "without departure from courtesy of phrase", has endeavoured "to meet him in a corresponding spirit." Moreover, this may be the proper place to observe, that, *Philalethes* having referred to Sarpi's History of the Council of Trent, Dr Wiseman (p. 96) thus notices the fact: "*Philalethes* quotes Sarpi's History of the Council; which is about as reasonable as to cite Voltaire for the History of Moses, or Gibbon for that of the Church." Father Paul's History is not very satisfactory, I believe, to Roman Catholics in general; but surely this is strange language to be used respecting

that valuable work. Dr Wiseman complains much of the various exaggerations, employed by his adversaries, on the different subjects discussed. I doubt whether there is, in all their writings put together, a single passage worthy to be compared, in that point of view, with the sentence just extracted from the learned author's *Reply*. The point to be decided, however, depends not upon Sarpi's History. The authentic decrees and canons of the Council—together with the difficulties of its position, from the circumstances of the times, as apparent from any history of that period—are sufficient to guide us to a right conclusion in the case.

Philalethes thus comments upon Dr Wiseman's account of the proceedings of the Council of Trent, in relation to the interpretation of the sixth chapter of St John :

“Really, Dr Wiseman must entertain a very mean opinion of the understanding of his readers. He says that the Council prudently refrained from defining any thing regarding the interpretation, which refers John vi. to the Eucharist, because the tradition of the Church was not decided for it. The Council, on the contrary, states, as the ground of its forbearance, that the Church having revelled in the opulence of two interpretations of the passage (directly opposed to each other, but both, on fitting occasions, serviceable against heretics) it ought not to be confined to the poverty of one. Can any thing be clearer than that the Council only refrained from defining that John vi. refers to the Eucharist, because it was convenient, in the controversy respecting the refusal of the cup to the laity, to deny that the passage had any such reference? Either John vi.

refers to the Eucharist or it does not; both interpretations cannot be true."

Dr Wiseman, having pronounced "the statements of Philalethes" to be "incorrect from first to last, and the inferences drawn from them consequently erroneous", alleges two considerations in proof of his assertion. This is one of them :

"He [Philalethes] has mistaken the conclusion for the motive. For I defy him to produce a single proof that the *reason*, for not defining more specially the interpretation of John vi., was the desire to have two admissible opinions instead of one in the Church. But, on the contrary, it is expressly stated that the two were retained *in consequence* of the division of opinion among the Fathers. For Sala, Bishop of Viviers, and Guerrero, Archbishop of Granada, who first opposed the definition, alleged no other reason than this. And the same was assigned in the answer of the theologians to the modification of the decree proposed by Salmeron and Torres." (*Reply*, p. 93.)

If Dr Wiseman really believes, as from his language he appears to do, that to show respect for the Fathers was the motive—the object—of the Council, in not fixing the interpretation of John vi.—and believes so because Sala, Bishop of Viviers &c. "alleged no other reason" than "the division of opinion among the Fathers"—he must certainly be a man of much easier faith, and far greater simplicity of mind, than can generally be met with. Philalethes, he says, "has mistaken the conclusion for the motive." Now when a conclusion is a matter of urgent necessity—affording the means of escape from pressing difficulties—

observers of what is passing will be apt to look *there* for the motives of action. To say nothing at present of the contentions abroad—with which that chapter of St John was intimately concerned—there were, in the Council itself, influential persons who held opposite opinions with regard to the application of the chapter. To the Roman See, therefore, it was of vast consequence not only not to offend either of the parties, but, if possible to conciliate them both. Fortunately, the Fathers had left the interpretation of that part of Scripture unsettled; and so an opening was left for the execution of such a design. Under these circumstances, the Council had recourse to an expedient, which, I trust, is unexampled in Ecclesiastical History. It decided that the opposite interpretations were both good. Nor was the Council shy of declaring the *reason*; so that, notwithstanding Dr Wiseman's *defiance*, Philalethes may produce the Council's own words employed for that purpose—"Cum eâ geminæ interpretationis opulentiâ de S. Ioannis testimonio Ecclesia frueretur, quarum utraque probationem ab hæreticis inde deductam impugnabat, ad unius tantummodo paupertatem non esse redigendam"—which he has rendered—"that the Church having revelled in the opulence of two interpretations of the passage, it ought not to be confined to the poverty of one."—I believe it to be utterly impossible to give any other intelligible account of the matter than this.

Dr Wiseman's second consideration is thus expressed :

“A still more grievous mistake is committed by Philalethes, when he supposes that the Council refrained from the definition, because two opposite opinions were useful against two different errors. He evidently imagines the words I quoted, “*quarum (interpretationum) utraque probationem ab hæreticis inde deductam impugnabat*”, to signify that each interpretation was useful against a different error ; as though the Church said to its theologians: ‘When pressed on the refusal of the cup to the laity, you may deny the chapter of St John to refer to the Eucharist at all ; when proving the Real Presence, you may urge this chapter as a strong proof.’ Such language would be not only unprincipled, but fit to put only into fools’ mouths ; and I wonder how a person of Philalethes’ character can have been so inconsiderate as to attribute it to such men as composed the Council of Trent....The *proof* or argument of Protestants, against which either interpretation of John vi. was opposed, is one and the same ; so that the Council (or rather the Divines in preparatory committee) thought that the question should be left undecided, on account of the diversity of opinions among the Fathers, especially as, by either interpretation, the argument for the use of the cup was equally refuted.” (*Reply*, p. 94.)

On the preceding extract I would observe that, whatever “the Church” *then* “said to its theologians”—and whether the language employed was “unprincipled” and “fit to put only into fools’ mouths,” or not—we know that its theologians, “when pressed on the refusal of the cup to the laity,” *have* denied—and therefore, we may presume, were allowed to deny—“the chapter of St John to refer to the Eucharist at all”: we likewise know that, “when proving the Real Presence”,

they *have* urged—and therefore, we conclude, were allowed to urge—“that chapter, as a strong proof”. Dr Wiseman, then, can scarcely mean that what the Church sanctions when done, it would have been unprincipled and absurd on the part of the Church to suggest. Perhaps he intends to reprobate the supposition, that the Church allowed *the same individual* theologian to explain the chapter, of the Eucharist, in one case—and to deny that it could be so explained, in another. The remarks of Philalethes do not depend upon that supposition; but if he so understood them, Dr W. would have well employed a few moments in illustrating, on the principles of his own communion, the rather obscure notion of the Church revelling in the opulence of two opposite interpretations—and at the same time refusing the privilege to any one of its members....The probability is, that the Council was sufficiently secure of the chapter being appealed to, when wanted, in proof of the real, corporal presence. It was moreover easy to say—and perhaps among members of the Council not difficult to induce the belief—that in the controversy with heretics “the argument for the use of the cup was equally refuted”—in whichever sense the chapter was understood. The Council of Trent, however, had not only to provide for the refutation of heretics, but also to consider how it might pacify great numbers of the adherents of the Roman See. Throughout a considerable portion of Roman

Catholic Europe, the people demanded the Sacramental Cup; and alleged the 6th chapter of St John, in proof of the justice of their claim. To have informed powerful and indignant nations, on the point of seceding from the Papal jurisdiction unless their wishes were attended to, that, *their* "argument for the use of the cup was equally refuted" by the 6th chapter of St John, whether applicable to the Eucharist or not, would have been a rash proceeding;—the Council therefore, after procrastinating till it could procrastinate no longer—after harassing and unsatisfactory debates—after pronouncing an *anathema* against any one who should affirm that "the faithful are obliged, by Divine precept as necessary to salvation, to receive the sacrament of the Eucharist in both kinds"—left the concession of the cup, as a matter of propriety or favour towards the faithful in some cases, undetermined; and agreed that the decision of the question should rest with the Pope. In fine, when all the circumstances of the case are taken into account, we naturally ask, with Philalethes, "Can any thing be clearer than that the Council only refrained from defining that John vi. refers to the Eucharist, because it was convenient, in the controversy respecting the refusal of the cup to the laity, to deny that the passage had any such reference?"

But it is right to allow Dr Wiseman to open his views still farther; this, indeed, he has done in the following manner:

“Now, that the Council, seeing the difference of opinion among the Fathers, should have delicately refrained from defining concerning John vi., seems reasonable enough: but I do not think it equally reasonable that they, who are in the same predicament, should find fault with this reserve. For the Anglican Church allows its members the same latitude of interpretation. I am, in fact, placed between two adversaries, one of whom (Philalethes) admits that John vi. refers to the Eucharist, while the other (Dr Turton) as strenuously denies it; giving to the latter part of the discourse the same meaning as to the first.” (*Reply*, p. 97.)

With regard to the first part of this extract, I will now only observe, that, had the meaning of John vi. never been discussed—or had the Council, after discussion, simply forborne to interpret the chapter—something might have been said of its having “delicately refrained” from doing so; but there really was no great delicacy in refusing to choose between two interpretations, for the purpose of securing both.....With regard to the latter part of the extract, I observe, that I know not *where* I “strenuously deny that John vi. refers to the Eucharist”; but if, as I must suppose from Dr Wiseman’s mode of writing, there is in any part of my work an appearance of having made such denial, I can safely affirm that the circumstance must be attributed to haste and inadvertence. My object was, to conduct the inquiry independently of that question; and accordingly, in p. 235 of the volume, I stated my purpose as follows: “The Roman Catholic Church does not require of its mem-

bers the belief that the 6th chapter of St John is to be interpreted of the Eucharist; nor does the Protestant Church of England affirm that the same chapter is *not* to be interpreted of the Eucharist. My object has been to show that the debateable part of the chapter is to be understood spiritually, as well as the remainder. That part may be understood sacramentally likewise; and may be so understood, without any supposed transfer of material properties—any transubstantiation of bread into flesh, and of wine into blood—on the illogical plan of the Romanists—and with the advantage of facilitating the explanation of the terms employed. With regard to the different Protestant interpretations here alluded to, I give no opinion. Neither my time nor my limits will suffice for an examination of the subject.” Such was my declared purpose; and there still seems to be no reason why I should not have endeavoured, as I did endeavour, to show that, whether the discourse is expounded of the Eucharist or not, the argument for the real, corporal presence equally fails..... I should not select that page of Dr Wiseman’s *Reply*, which dwells upon the alleged discrepancy between Philalethes and myself, as exhibiting a very favourable specimen of the author’s “style and manner”.

A few remarks upon the different views which have been taken, of our Lord’s discourse

in John vi., may not improperly close this section.

Dr Wiseman, in his first Lecture, (p. 34), meets an objection to his proposed plan, of proving the truth of the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist, by a simple appeal to Scripture:—the objection being that such a plan may “tend to diminish the authority of the Church and of Tradition, by making the interpretation of Scripture depend upon human ingenuity and learning, rather than upon the authority of an infallible guide.” The learned writer first laments, with Novalis, “an acute and amiable Protestant philosopher”—that there ever should have been “mixed up with the concerns of religion another perfectly foreign and earthly science—philology—whose destructive influence cannot but be recognised” from the time of Luther; thus holding “that this philological method of learning religion is one of the most pernicious evils we owe to the reformation.” He then acknowledges “that Catholic controvertists, especially in England and Germany, have greatly erred by allowing themselves to be led by Protestants into a war of detail”; but still he is of opinion that “the state of the controversy at the present day renders it expedient to treat the questions philologically.” Dr Wiseman then replies to the objection, in substance, that “all the controvertists of the Roman Church had treated the arguments from

Scripture distinctly from Tradition"—that "the Church decides the dogma....but, generally speaking, leaves the discussion of individual passages to the care of theologians"—and finally, that "a dogma drawn from a text, by a mere theological argument of authority....must be at the same time the *only* interpretation which sound hermeneutical principles can give." These statements, when applied to the interpretation of John vi., easily lead to very erroneous conclusions; more especially as there is nothing, throughout Dr Wiseman's Lectures on that chapter, to excite the slightest suspicion that any of the old Fathers, or that a single Roman Catholic divine, had ever interpreted the chapter otherwise than of the Eucharist. In point of fact, the differences of opinion on the subject are so mentioned, as to leave an impression on the mind, that they are peculiar to members of Protestant communions. Opportunities for pointing out those differences are carefully made use of; and even the fourth and last Lecture on John vi. is not brought to an end, without once more recurring to the topic, in the following strain:

"I might be allowed to dwell, after having answered all objections, upon the variety of interpretation into which Protestant divines have necessarily run, in consequence of their abandoning the literal sense. Hardly two of them can be said to agree in their explanation; and terms of condemnation sufficiently harsh are used in their mutual confutations. But I have been already so diffuse, that I dare not detain you

longer upon this chapter; and must, therefore, omit likewise, what would not be devoid of interest, the exhibition of the laboured and lengthy, and often not very intelligible, paraphrases, by which they are compelled to explain our Saviour's expressions." (Lectures, p. 145.)

Now, aware, as Dr Wiseman was, of the great variety of interpretations, of the chapter, to be found among the divines of his own communion—a greater variety, I believe, than exists among Protestant writers—it must have required some *courage* thus to cast reproaches on the differences of opinion, on the subject, *without* the pale of his own Church. But I have elsewhere recorded the learned author's intrepidity....Dr Wiseman, moreover, seems to think it strange that Protestant writers should dwell, with some pertinacity, upon the above-mentioned diversities of sentiment among Roman Catholic divines. Under the circumstances of the case, this proceeding most assuredly ought not to excite his surprise.

SECTION IV.

CHANGE OF SUBJECT IN THE SIXTH CHAPTER OF ST JOHN.

1. IMPRESSED with Dr Wiseman's formal announcement of his proposed division of John vi. at the 48th verse—with the great pains which had manifestly been bestowed in establishing the division—the material advantages to the main argument to be derived from it—the repeated references to it in the subsequent Lectures—and, in short, the ingenuity of the notion, forming (so far as I could judge) the most striking part of the whole performance—I naturally endeavoured to ascertain, from the instances in which the division was adverted to, the real objects which it was intended to secure. This I did with becoming care; and (pp. 55—59) stated the result of my researches. Dr Wiseman, in his *Reply*, p. 101, intimates that I have completely mistaken his views; which is not improbable—inasmuch as he now informs the world that the whole proof of the division might have been cut out of his book without detriment—the said division being of no importance whatever to his argument. The new light, which the learned author has thus thrown

upon the matter, effectually precludes any solicitude, which I might otherwise have felt, with regard to my misapprehensions on this point.

2. Some objections, to my statements in relation to the first part—that is, Dr Wiseman's first part, to v. 48—of our Lord's discourse, are now to be considered—as briefly as possible. The learned author thus writes:

“I observed that, in the first part of the discourse, our Lord never applies the term *to eat* to himself, or to the bread which he shall give . . . I only stated *the fact* that our Lord did not use, or rather studiously abstained from using, this word [*eat*]. . . I asserted that Christ ‘does not once use the expression *to eat* in this part of the discourse’. This is a question of fact, and the Professor meets it by saying, that our Lord *insinuated* it! The assertion was about a *word*; the answer is about an *idea*.” (*Reply*, p. 102).

Now, in direct opposition to all these affirmations respecting the *fact* of the *term*, and the *word* being used, and not the *idea*—I affirm that the sentence of Dr Wiseman, which I quoted and commented upon, was this—“He (Christ) does not suffer *the idea* of *eating him* to escape his lips;” and that I made (p. 69) the following observation on the subject—“Whatever *idea* may be thought to have ‘escaped his lips’, we certainly do not find that he speaks of *eating him*, before the 57th verse; which, as it belongs to the latter part, may be reserved for future consideration.” Whether my view of the subject

was right or wrong, is another matter—about which I shall now give myself no trouble. It is enough for me to point out the grossness of Dr Wiseman's misrepresentation.

Dr Wiseman, in his Lectures, p. 54, thus continued his remarks: "Not once, through this [first] section of the discourse, does our Lord use the expression *to eat* even the bread of life." On this I observed (p. 69), that the learned author referred to "his own unwarrantable division between the 47th and 48th verses;" and that "the expression occurs in the 50th verse, which every one had previously assigned to the first part." In the *Reply*, p. 103, we find no more than—"This is only a repetition of the Professor's ungrounded assertion disproved in chapter iii.;" to which I now respond, that I have seen no reason to think my assertion ungrounded—and that I do not find it disproved in chapter iii.... In p. 35 of the *Reply*, Dr Wiseman writes—"It is perfectly incorrect in Dr T. to say that my arguments in the 'next section' are in the least built upon my division—for *not one* argument is founded upon phrases occurring between vv. 48 and 51:"—to which I answer—*Here*—namely, in what was called the "next section"—is an argument founded upon a phrase so occurring. It is founded on the expression *to eat* the bread of life: the expression exists in v. 50, which relates to the bread of life and to those who "may *eat* thereof": and

v. 50, together with its phrases, will be found “occurring between vv. 48 and 51.” Remove Dr Wiseman’s proposed division, and the argument vanishes....The learned author’s utter indifference about his division, in p. 35 of his *Reply*, renders his zeal in its cause, in p. 103, sufficiently striking. With regard to the subsequent reasoning on the meaning of the verb *to give*, in our Lord’s discourse, I will only say, that I have no wish to diminish any satisfaction which Dr Wiseman may derive, from such an argument on such a subject.

The learned author’s next complaint of me I will give, together with his vindication of himself, in his own words—omitting what is not needed for the understanding of the subject:

“Dr Turton charges me with having, at the outset of my second Lecture, professed to be showing that the phrases which occur in the first part of our Lord’s discourse *were calculated to convey* the idea of listening to the doctrines of our Lord; and then with having concluded that the Jews *did* so understand it. ‘The discourse’, writes Dr T., ‘*was calculated to produce a certain effect upon the Jews—therefore it did produce that effect; on the principle, I suppose, that to point out what, in any case, ought to be the conduct of men, is only another method of ascertaining what it really was*’. I am not sufficiently acute to see the force of this parallelism, &c....I then devoted another paragraph of a page (of which, strange to say, Dr T. who is so minute in his strictures, takes no notice) to show how, ‘even if the expressions used by our Saviour had not been so consonant with customary language, the pains which he takes to explain his words must have removed all possible obscurity’....Dr Turton (no doubt unthinkingly) changes *could not*

[possibly] *misunderstand* into *did* understand, and on this bases his censure. Yet there is a wide difference between the two: the first, *my* inference, is the natural result of the proofs, a conclusion from my argument: the second, Dr T's attribution to me, would be indeed an assertion of a matter of fact, which I never made." (*Reply*, pp. 104—106.)

Dr Wiseman's proposition, at the opening of his second Lecture, was this: "The phrases which occur in the first part of the discourse were *calculated to convey* to the minds of those who heard our Saviour, the idea of listening to his doctrines and believing in him; the more so, as he positively explained them in that sense." To this proposition, which I extracted word for word, I, in p. 64, distinctly gave my assent; and therefore I need say nothing, about Dr Wiseman's charge against me, of not noticing the reference to our Lord's explanations of his own words. What I objected to was—that, in the proposition originally laid down, the phrases and explanations were stated to be *calculated to convey* certain spiritual meanings to the minds of the hearers—but that, in the proposition finally enunciated as proved, it was affirmed that those who had heard such phrases and explanations *could not possibly misunderstand them*—nor give them any other interpretation than the one pointed out. These two propositions are not only very different in words, but very distinguishable in signification; so that, at the best, there is something exceedingly irregular in the mode of reasoning. When, besides, we take into

account how nearly such turns of speech, as *could not possibly misunderstand—must have understood*—and so on, approach, in common usage, to *did understand*—how often they are employed for the purpose of leaving such an impression upon the hearer—we can easily perceive that the proposition, which Dr Wiseman set out with, might be perfectly true, and yet his final proposition, as apprehended by the reader, altogether false. In fine, Dr Wiseman's argument from John vi. depended upon two alleged facts—viz. that, after our Lord's explanation, the Jews understood his discourse, (1) to the end of the 47th verse, correctly in a spiritual sense—(2) from that point, correctly in a literal sense; and I believed the final proposition under discussion to have been constructed so as to affirm the first of these facts. Yet my belief was not expressed absolutely, as might be supposed from the last extract from Dr Wiseman; but was modified by the following introductory sentence: "My hope is that 'I cannot possibly misunderstand' the learned author, when I suppose him to affirm, that the Jews actually *did* give a spiritual interpretation to the first part." So that the reader was in possession of the fullest intelligence respecting my views of the subject. And this is all that I shall observe upon my, "no doubt unthinkingly, having changed *could not [possibly] misunderstand* into *did understand*".... That Dr Wiseman held the Jews to have understood the discourse, from

v. 35 to the end of v. 47, spiritually of believing in Christ, may be ascertained from the following passage of his Lectures (p. 92), although not very clearly expressed: "We have before seen, that, upon the Jews misunderstanding our Saviour's metaphorical expressions, in the former part of his discourse, he clearly explained them, at v. 35, as relative to faith; and that after this, he continues in a literal train of instruction through the rest of that discourse. Hence we find, that *on this head the Jews were satisfied*, for they now only object to his saying that he came down from Heaven."

3. According to Dr Wiseman's arrangement of subjects, we now come to his reasons—six in number—for believing that at v. 48 the topic of our Lord's discourse is completely changed—namely, from faith in Christ, to the actual eating of his flesh. In three of those reasons, the first, the second and the fourth—as discussed in the *Reply*—I am so little concerned, that I need not detain the reader with any comments upon them. I would only point out, in the discussion on the second, what Dr Wiseman thinks an hypercriticism upon him.... The learned author, in his Lectures (p. 57), wrote thus: "We have seen how carefully our Lord avoids, throughout the first part, the harsh expression to *eat him*, even where the turn of his phrase seemed to invite him to use it; on the contrary, in the latter section, he employs it without

scruple, and even repeats it again and again.”— In p. 81, I observed—“Our Lord has used the expression, to *eat him, once*; that is, in the 57th verse;—but so far was he from ‘repeating’ it again and again’, that he has never used it except *that once*.” “This”, says Dr Wiseman in his *Reply*, p. 109, “is mere hypercriticism: any reader less prejudiced would have understood that, under this abridged form, I included the application of the term to Christ’s flesh.” We may therefore infer that Dr Wiseman considered *to eat him* and *to eat his flesh* as equivalent expressions.

Dr Wiseman’s third reason for the change of subject at v. 48 was thus stated, p. 58:

“So long as Christ speaks of himself as the object of faith, under the image of a spiritual food, he represents his food as given *by the Father*; but after verse 47, he speaks of the food, which he now describes, as to be given *by himself*.... This marked difference in the *giver* of the two communications.... points out that a different *gift* is likewise promised.”

This notion—of *God* being the giver in the former part of the discourse, and *our Lord himself* in the latter—I described, in p. 84, as a mistake; inasmuch as, “when our Lord (v. 27) first recommended this spiritual food to his hearers, he used the following terms: ‘Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which THE SON OF MAN shall give unto you.’” I now present Dr Wiseman’s manner of meeting this objection,

in his *Reply*, p. 111:—"I have already remarked that our Lord's discourse properly begins at v. 35....To what then does the expression in v. 27 refer? I answer, to the Eucharist. This was the natural topic suggested by the miracle of the multiplied loaves, and of it Jesus designed to treat. The interruptions of the Jews, and their perverse asking of a new sign, led him to introduce (*incidentally and parenthetically*) the introductory discourse concerning faith."—This is probably one of the cases in which Dr Wiseman "feels a confidence, such as perhaps a Protestant divine cannot, in conclusions which accord with the decisions of God's Church;" and thus may we account for his decision that "the Eucharist was the natural topic suggested by the miracle of the loaves"—that "of *it* our Lord designed to treat"—and that "the introductory discourse concerning faith was incidental and parenthetic." But the authority of the Infallible Church is required, not only as a warrant for the preceding assumptions—but also for the privilege, which appears to be claimed by Dr Wiseman, of holding two contradictory opinions. He taught us, in his Lectures, that the discourse was on faith, from the 26th verse to the 48th. He now teaches us that the discourse is *first* on the Sacrament; and *then* on faith, from the 35th verse to the 48th: and he does not inform us that he has changed his mind. That, in his former productions, the learned author

held the whole of the first part of the discourse (vv. 26—47) to relate solely and exclusively to faith, shall be proved from a few out of many passages which might be produced :

“ You are aware that most Catholics divide the chapter into three portions, while most Protestants consider the two last portions as only composing one whole. From the first to the twenty-sixth verse, we have an historical detail.... At the twenty-sixth verse his discourse commences.... On the signification of his discourse as far as the 48th or 51st verse, Protestants and Catholics are equally agreed, it refers to believing in him.” (Lectures, pp. 37—39.)

“ We have before seen, that, upon the Jews misunderstanding our Saviour’s metaphorical expressions, in the former part of his discourse, he clearly explained them, at v. 35, as relative to faith.” (Lectures, p. 92.)

“ All are agreed, both Catholics and Protestants, that the first part of the chapter, from the beginning to the 26th verse, is simply historical.... All are also agreed as to the next portion of the chapter ; that is, from the 26th, so far as about the 50th verse, that in it our Saviour’s discourse is exclusively about faith.” (Moorfields Lectures, Vol. II. p. 140.)

Such, but two or three years since, were the opinions instilled into the minds of students at Rome, and enforced upon the audience at Moorfields, London. As to the discourse from the 26th verse to the 48th, all was unanimity. It was agreed, by Roman Catholics and Protestants without a dissentient voice, that that portion was “ exclusively about faith”. And now, the same oracle proclaims to the world that “ the 27th verse refers to the Eucharist”—that “ the discourse properly begins at v. 35”—and that the part of the

discourse touching faith is "incidental and parenthetic." Having already acknowledged my inability to render any service in the kind of explanation required in a case like this, I avail myself of my acknowledgment, and leave the reader to dispose of the matter as he may think proper.

I shall close the subject with this reflection: How singular that a simple reference to the 27th verse should have produced so different a plan, from that formerly adopted, of interpreting this sixth chapter; if indeed Dr Wiseman considers it to be different—which, as we are left in the dark on the point, I neither affirm nor deny.

The main thing to be noticed, in connexion with Dr Wiseman's fifth reason, is a charge preferred against me in these terms: "I have had to point out abundant instances of misrepresentation of my sentiments, and misinterpretation of my expressions. I now charge him with FALSIFICATION of my words." (*Reply*, p. 117). Of the "abundant instances of misrepresentation of Dr Wiseman's sentiments and misinterpretation of his expressions", which he "has had to point out", the reader of the foregoing pages will be able to form some judgement. I am not aware that I have omitted to record any alleged instances of that nature.—The passage, to which the charge of FALSIFICATION relates, may be found in Dr Wiseman's Lectures, p. 61, and in my volume on the Eucharist, p. 87; and shall be once more transcribed:

“If to feed on Christ mean to believe in Christ, then, to eat the flesh of Christ (if the phrase has to be considered parallel) must signify to believe *in the flesh* of Christ. This is absurd; for the flesh and blood of Christ was not an object of faith to those who really sinned by believing him too literally to be only a man; nor can our belief in them be the source of eternal life.”

It is worthy of remark that Dr Wiseman's mode of writing, in the preceding extract, was deemed so strange by *Philalethes*, as to draw from him the censure implied in the expression “paltry quibbling”; and *Philalethes*—as Dr Wiseman confesses—“generally preserves a becoming dignity of phrase.” Most willingly do I avow my sense of the superior judgement of *Philalethes*, in his treatment of that extract. I now feel how hopeless must have been any attempt of mine to understand a passage by him designated as “paltry quibbling”. On a review of that extract, I can scarcely imagine a mistake, for which it will not furnish a good excuse. The fact, then, is—that when I found this reasoning—“If to feed on Christ mean to believe in Christ—then, to eat the flesh of Christ must signify to believe *in the flesh* of Christ. This is absurd”—I referred the word “this” to what *immediately preceded*; and conceiving Dr Wiseman to have affirmed that “to believe *in the flesh* of Christ” is “absurd”, I stated that proposition as his. If I was wrong in so doing, the reader at that time had the extract fairly before him; and therefore was as well

able to judge of that matter, as the reader is at the present moment. In his *Reply*, Dr Wiseman has two pages (117—119) of comment upon the crime laid to my charge; and finally entreats his reader “to calculate what his adversary’s triumph and scorn would have been, had he ever detected *him* [Dr Wiseman] in such a practice as this.”—I ought also to observe that the learned author has expatiated upon the meaning of the passage; but from some cause or other, I can make neither more nor less of its object, than I did when it first engaged my attention. And so much for the alleged FALSIFICATION of Dr Wiseman’s words.

A few pages back—that is, in p. 74—Dr Wiseman accused me of hypercriticism in supposing that, when writing of our Lord, he could do otherwise than include, in the term *eating him*, the *eating of his flesh*. We now find the learned author drawing a distinction between the expressions; and, so far as I can perceive, attributing to his opponents, as a consequence, a corresponding distinction between believing in *Christ* and believing in *his flesh*. This is stated for the sole purpose of showing that my mind is still perplexed in my attempts to understand the drift of the extract in the last page....Philalethes was right.

My object, in drawing up these observations, being not so much to vindicate my opinions and arguments, when they happen to differ from those

of Dr Wiseman, as to examine those “abundant instances of misrepresentation of his sentiments and misinterpretation of his expressions” which he has “had to point out”—I have but little to state, respecting the learned author’s sixth reason for believing that there is a change of topic at the 48th verse. Under this head, however, there is one complaint against me, which I will exhibit in his own words, as given in his *Reply*, pp. 122, 123 :

“I must not omit to point out to the reader another instance of Dr Turton’s habitual inaccuracy in stating my views, in spite of his ‘consciousness of having represented every thing faithfully’. He asserts that ‘Dr W. holds that in John vi. *love*, or *charity*, is the internal principle implied in *eating the flesh* of Christ, according to his own literal sense.’ Now I never asserted any such thing. I said, indeed, that in the latter portion of the discourse, the *effects*, attributed to eating the flesh of Christ, are such as represent love. There is a great difference between these two things ; and the substitution of one for the other gives Dr T’s argument, at the moment (an argument otherwise not worthy of a serious answer), an air of more plausibility.”

When I stated that, according to Dr Wiseman, *love*, or *charity*, is “the internal principle implied in *eating the flesh* of Christ,” in the literal sense—I alluded to the following passage in his Lectures, p. 59 —“After the place where we suppose the transition made, he speaks no longer of our coming to him, but of *our abiding in him, and he in us*. And this is a phrase which always intimates union *by love*.” And I do still

think that Dr Wiseman, in the passage now quoted, seemed to represent *love*, as “the internal principle implied in *eating the flesh* of Christ”—notwithstanding his declaration that “he never asserted any such thing.” Any difference in words—although without a perceptible change of meaning—would probably be, in Dr Wiseman’s estimation, another instance of my “habitual inaccuracy in stating his views.” For my own part, being a plain man—and so, by no means solicitous about modes of expression—I really should have supposed that, to say—“the effects, attributed to eating are such as represent *love*”—would be much the same as to say—“*love* is the internal principle implied in eating”—as its *effect*, if you please; for my phrase no more *excluded* the principle of *love* as an *effect*, than Dr Wiseman’s other phrase, respecting *union by love*, verbally included it.....I observe, indeed, (Lectures, p. 60) another sentence on the subject; but it is by no means free from obscurity, any more than is the sentence—“the effects, attributed to eating the flesh of Christ, are such as represent *love*.”.... So much for my “habitual inaccuracy in stating” Dr Wiseman’s views.

After all, my mode of expressing, what I believed to be Dr Wiseman’s meaning, has done him some service. It has furnished him with a decisive sentence, in reply to an argument which I had advanced. “There is a great difference”, the

learned author writes, "between these two things; and the substitution of one for the other gives Dr. T's argument for the moment (an argument otherwise not worthy of a serious answer), an air of more plausibility."—That I am not, even yet, ashamed of the argument, may be collected from my now offering it to the reader's notice:

"To say the truth, Dr. Wiseman, while discussing this topic, writes like a man who is convinced that his argument is invulnerable; nevertheless, there will be no great difficulty in discovering its weak points. After the learned author had employed almost twenty pages in proving that *to eat the flesh* of any one is used *metaphorically* in a bad sense, so that, when interpreting John vi, the metaphorical meaning must be discarded—he ought, by all means, to have added a few pages, to show that *to eat the flesh* of any one is used *literally* in a good sense, so that there was a positive reason for maintaining the literal meaning in opposition to the figurative. If extraneous usage is to be the test in one case, we are justified in expecting that it should be produced in another. Dr. Wiseman holds that, in John vi. *love*, or *charity*, is the internal principle implied in *eating the flesh* of Christ, according to his own literal sense: he ought, then, to follow up his own plan; and make out, by citations from the Old Testament, the Arabic, the Syriac, the Greek, and so on, that the literal eating of the flesh of a person, with a feeling of *love* and *charity*, admits of exemplification." (pp. 92, 93.)

I have, as the reader is already aware, no intention to discuss either the validity of arguments summarily condemned, or mere differences of opinion. Let the preceding passage be considered as a specimen of the work from which it is extracted, by any reader who happens to be unacquainted with that work; and as he will not perhaps discover

in it the indications of a disposition to urge anything unfairly, he may be disposed to hesitate, before he condemns unread the volume of which it forms a part.

If I mistake not, considerable light has now been thrown upon the character of Dr Wiseman's *Reply*. From this period, I shall confine my attention, more and more strictly, to such charges of stratagem, manœuvre, misrepresentation, and so on, as may be alleged against me. My opinion, indeed, is, that I might henceforward very properly spare myself much of the trouble which I have hitherto taken, with regard to that work. There are considerations, however, which seem to render perseverance a duty; and therefore I shall endeavour to persevere.

SECTION V.

JEWISH PREJUDICES AND MODES OF INTERPRETING OUR LORD'S DISCOURSES.

1. DR WISEMAN having laid down, as principles to guide him in the interpretation of the discourse in the sixth chapter of St John, two maxims—the one from Mr Burke, namely, that “in all bodies, those who will lead, must also, in a considerable degree, follow: they must conform their propositions to the taste, talent and disposition of those whom they wish to conduct”—the other from Dr Whateley, that “the preacher, who is intent upon carrying his point, should use all such precautions as are not inconsistent with it, to avoid raising unfavourable impressions in his hearers”—I could not avoid considering how far such maxims were really applicable to our Lord, as a divine instructor. Those maxims, indeed, appeared to be formed with reference to what is expedient in the eyes of men; and so, although completely adapted to Mr Burke’s leader of a popular assembly—the sort of person whom he had in view—and not ill comporting with Dr Whateley’s preacher, were, in my estimation, altogether unsuited to the character of our Re-

deemer, as pourtrayed in the Gospels. They seemed to be inexpressibly derogatory to that character; and therefore I stated my opinion on the whole matter, in terms not to be mistaken. To say the truth, I am glad I did so. That is not an opinion to be repented of. The subject has many important bearings, and much might be said upon it; but let the reader judge for himself of the propriety with which Dr Wiseman has applied the maxims to our Lord. In a case of this kind, proof is out of question. Feeling must decide the point.

Although I thought the simple enunciation of Mr Burke's maxim sufficient to show that it ought not to be applied to our Lord's conduct, I was anxious that the readers of my work should know how far Mr Burke himself was from applying it to persons employed in the duties of moral or religious instruction. I therefore produced from his 'Reflections on the Revolution in France', the passage of which the maxim forms a part; thus proving that Mr Burke's attention was directed to the mode of governing an excited multitude, assembled for political purposes. Dr Wiseman (*Reply*, pp. 133—135) censures me for thus giving the context of Mr Burke's maxim; selects a sentence from the context, and asks me whether I mean to insinuate, &c.; maintains that it is not usual to cite contexts; and declares that the whole proceeding is "a miserable trick". But

I will extract a few sentences from the learned author, on the subject :

“ Dr T. goes to Burke’s work, and finds that the words I have extracted are in a passage treating of the revolutionary party ; and, therefore, is struck with horror at my applying it to our Saviour’s teaching. To calm this awful feeling, which gives occasion to a very effective display, I need only observe that Burke introduces the words I quote, as a general *axiom*, applicable to virtuous assemblies as well as to wicked ones, to virtuous as to vicious instructors. He goes on to say, ‘ *therefore*, if an assembly is viciously or feebly composed’, &c. Does Dr T. mean to insinuate, that by taking the orator’s axiom, I can be reasonably charged with applying it to a similar case, when all the circumstances prove that I consider ours one clean the contrary? Surely the Professor will not maintain that it is usual or just—to trace every quotation of a general remark to its sources, with the idea that the citer is bound to adopt the particular application of it in the original. . . . And if not, surely it is a miserable trick—to act as he has done, and try to excite indignation against a quotation, by citing passages which were neither alluded to, nor in the least connected with, the use made of the citation.”

I have already given my reasons for thinking that I was called upon to state the occasion of Mr Burke’s maxim. . . . I did not particularly direct the reader’s attention to the sentence singled out by Dr Wiseman ; and therefore did not insinuate anything. . . . Whether the context of a quotation shall be produced, must depend, not on general rules, but on peculiar circumstances. A reference of this kind may be absolutely indispensable in one instance, and thoroughly impertinent in another. . . . What Dr Wiseman describes as “ a miserable trick”, I felt to be a bounden duty. In

so different a light may the same action appear to different persons.

Respecting that great end of our Lord's personal ministrations—the spiritual welfare of his countrymen—there could be no dispute between Dr Wiseman and myself; and if the learned lecturer had taken this circumstance into account, he might have rendered his *Reply* shorter by several pages. Had he borne in mind that the question under consideration related not to *the end*, but to the methods employed with a view to that end, he must have felt assured that my expressions could refer only to the methods employed. When, for instance, I wrote thus (p. 109): “If we may judge from our Lord's own proceeding, he must have frequently had some other object, besides that mentioned by Dr Wiseman—namely, that of ‘gaining the attention of the Jews, and conciliating their esteem’”—it is pretty clear that the phrase, “some other object”, must mean “some other method”—and cannot in any way refer to “the end” above mentioned: and therefore, although I inadvertently used the word “object”, which Dr Wiseman had applied to “gaining over the Jews to the doctrines of Christianity”, nothing whatever depended upon that word. Any other word, as “purpose”, when considered as indicating the manner of discourse, method of procedure, &c. &c. would have suited the sentence just as well. The point for discussion was our

Lord's alleged *purpose* (let us call it) of "gaining the attention of the Jews and conciliating their esteem"—for his *discourses*, according to Dr Wiseman's explanation given in his *Reply*.—More than this I will not offer, by way of observation upon that paragraph (pp. 136, 137), which begins with "a remark upon another of my clever performances"—and ends with phrases respecting "solemn trifling, or something much worse"—"a palpable falsification of words"—and "proving that our Lord's object in his ministry was not to conciliate esteem."

By means of an axiom, to be considered as generally applicable to our Lord's manner of discourse, Dr Wiseman seems to have intended to give a colouring, in favour of his own views, to certain portions of the discourse in John vi. It appeared to me when formerly considering the subject, as it does still appear, that, instead of proceeding on the assumption of an axiom—which is, in all cases, liable to the objection of having been framed with an eye to a particular result—the most satisfactory method of arriving at a *principle* would be an examination of the facts, presented by our Lord's discourses, as recorded in the Gospels. For this purpose, I quoted Luke xii. 49, 51; where we find our Lord declaring—"I am come to send fire on the earth."—"Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather division":—also Luke xiv. 26—"If any man

come to me, and hate not his father and mother, &c. yea and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." I quoted these, as showing that there were occasions on which our Lord's immediate purpose could not be, according to the axiom borrowed from Mr Burke, "to conform his propositions to the taste, talent and disposition" of his hearers—or, to use Dr Wiseman's own language, "to gain their attention and conciliate their esteem"—either for his doctrines or himself.... After stating that "most of the Fathers, as St Ambrose, &c. understand by the fire (Luke xii. 49) which Jesus wished vehemently to see kindled, the light and flame of the Holy Spirit, faith, devotion and charity; and that Tertullian, followed by one or two others, understands the hatred and persecutions which were to pursue his faithful disciples"—Dr Wiseman asks, "What does this example prove, if the interpretation of antiquity have any weight?"—I answer, Whichever of those interpretations are taken, it proves that our Lord did not, in that instance, "conform his propositions to the taste, talent and disposition" of his hearers. The learned author, however, is right in supposing that "I prefer the opinion of more modern commentators, who explain this text, by the words that follow, of dissension and discord." On this supposition he thus writes:

"Once more I ask, whither does this quotation tend? If it be directed to confute my assertion, that Christ was

anxious to draw all to himself, and was intent upon his object of converting the Jews, then I must conclude that Dr Turton alleges it to prove that, on the contrary, our Lord wished to produce dissension, &c. and only a partial conversion. And this is nothing short of downright blasphemy. If, on the other hand, he considers these words as only indicating the consequences—not certainly desired, but only foreseen—of our divine Master’s teaching, and therefore cites them only to prove that he did not shrink from proposing the most disagreeable truths to his hearers: then, I ask, what assertion of mine does that confute, seeing that I have clearly asserted as much in three distinct places, and at some length, viz.: in p. 28; again, at p. 91; and, finally, at p. 131.” (*Reply*, p. 141.)

With regard to the first supposition in the preceding extract—Dr Wiseman must have very well known that the discussion turned upon the means employed by our Lord, and not upon the end proposed to be obtained by them. With regard to the second supposition—which is the true one—the quotation tends, with others of a like character, to show the impropriety of adopting Mr Burke’s axiom, as a measure of our Lord’s conduct....Dr Wiseman refers, as we have seen, to three places in his Lectures, in which he touches upon our Lord’s *indifference to mere popularity*, &c.; but of what avail are those passages, so long as the learned author can apply Mr Burke’s axiom, as the means of interpreting our Lord’s discourses, whenever the expedient may be thought desirable?

On such texts as Luke xii. 49, 51; and xiv. 26; many useful observations might be offered. This, however, is not the proper occasion for an

undertaking of that kind. I must content myself with entreating the reader to consider how few of the divine dispensations are carried on by means which are in perfect accordance with *our* notions of things; and to acknowledge, with St Paul, that “HIS ways are past finding out.”

2. In proof that the Jews rightly understood the phrases of eating the flesh of Christ (John vi. 51—56) in a literal sense, Dr Wiseman, (in his Lectures, pp. 95—103), endeavoured to establish, by an examination of particular instances, the following positions: (1) “Whenever our Saviour’s expressions were *erroneously* taken in their literal sense, it was his constant practice instantly to explain himself, and let his audience understand, that his words were to be taken figuratively;”—(2) “When his words were *rightly* understood in their literal sense, and by that correct interpretation gave rise to murmurs or objections, it was his custom to stand to his words, and repeat again the very sentiment which had given the offence.” On the instances adduced by Dr Wiseman, some remarks were made, in my *Roman Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist considered*. I now proceed to notice what seems to require notice, in the learned author’s *Reply*, so far as those instances are concerned—beginning with the cases in which “our Lord’s figurative expressions were wrongly taken in the literal sense.” (*Reply*, p. 145.)

(1) The first case was thus discussed by Dr Wiseman in his Lectures :

“The first example, which I shall give, is a well-known conversation between our Saviour and Nicodemus, (John iii. 3—6) ‘Jesus answered and said unto him, Amen, Amen, I say unto thee, unless a man be *born again*, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.’ This expression was one in ordinary use among the Jewish doctors, to express proselytism. Nicodemus, whether from wilfulness or error, took the words in their literal import, and made an objection precisely similar in form to that of the Jews: ‘How *can* a man be born when he is old?’ Our Saviour instantly explains the words in their figurative meaning to him, by repeating them with such a modification as could leave no farther doubt of the sense in which he spoke them. ‘Amen, Amen, I say unto thee, unless a man be born again of *water* and the *Holy Ghost*, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven.’” (pp. 95, 96.)

In commenting on the foregoing extract, I first pointed out the difference of disposition between Nicodemus in John iii., and the people of Capernaum in John vi.—as indicated by an apparent desire to learn in the one case, and a manifest determination to cavil in the other; and thus inferred that our Lord might afford an explanation to Nicodemus, and yet withhold one from the Jews. When, moreover, I observed that the Council of Trent had “pronounced a curse upon him who should turn our Lord’s words, *Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit*, into any kind of metaphor”—or understand them otherwise than of the sacrament of Baptism by water—the probable conclusion seemed to be that what would have appeared to Dr Wiseman, under other cir-

cumstances, the obvious interpretation, gave way to a "figurative meaning" better suited to the purpose immediately in hand.

Dr Wiseman allows (*Reply*, p. 145)—but mainly, I think, for the sake of argument—that "Nicodemus was an upright man, seeking the truth"; and that "the multitudes in John vi. were of a contrary character".—"Still", he goes on to say, "if no point can be shown where our Lord's conduct actually *did* change in his dealings with men of different classes, this instance has a right to be brought in, as one of a series, tending to establish the principle whereon Jesus universally acted." Such are Dr Wiseman's notions of things in his *Reply*; but in his Lectures (p. 29), when laying down his principles of interpretation, he thus described the conduct of "a kind and skilful teacher", with a view to our Lord's discourses:—"He will address himself very differently to friends or to enemies; to those who are hearkening in order to learn, or those who are listening only to find fault." When, besides, Dr Wiseman was discussing the objection, that "we have many instances in the New Testament, where our Lord, far from giving such explanations [as Dr W. imagined] seems rather desirous of keeping his hearers in the dark"—he thought it a satisfactory account of the matter to allege, as in the case of the woman of Samaria (John iv), that our Lord's observations were not received with the kind of

disposition to which an explanation was likely to be vouchsafed. How all this is to be reconciled with the learned author's hypothetical case—"if no point can be shown where our Lord's conduct actually *did* change in his dealings with men of different classes"—I know not. I am once more in a region in which I invariably lose my way.

With regard to the omission of the sacrament of Baptism, in the interpretation of the discourse with Nicodemus, Dr Wiseman writes thus:

"I really was not aware of the fact, till he [Dr T.] remarked it. I am obliged to him for it: in another edition the word shall, if possible, be introduced, though only to show that it was no particular convenience to me *not* to mention baptism. In fact, so far from my having 'studiously avoided the term baptism' here, upon reading the paragraph over again, I do not well see where I shall be able to introduce it." (*Reply*, p. 146.)

The preceding paragraph, notwithstanding its free and easy air, exceedingly confirms me in the belief, that the interpretation—namely, *of Baptism*—which Dr Wiseman would most probably have given, as a matter of course, on another occasion—would have been somewhat troublesome in this instance; and that an explanation, involving a "figurative meaning" and "a modification", was better calculated to lessen difficulties. My objections went as far as this—that *even the word* was omitted. *The mere insertion* of the word would not remove my objections. When Dr Wiseman states, as he does, p. 146, that "I am

obliged to acknowledge that he has, in other instances, applied the passage to Baptism"—he seems to mistake the object of my remarks. The application of the passage to Baptism in other instances furnished a strong reason for expecting the same application in the case under consideration. When a man has interpreted a passage of Scripture in a certain way, is he, on that account, at liberty to interpret it otherwise, whenever he thinks proper to do so?.....Again, in p. 147 Dr Wiseman writes: "The explanation to Nicodemus....did not reach the *manner* in which the regeneration by Baptism was to be performed: it only satisfied him of its spiritual nature." So far as I can understand this affirmation, it appears to be looked upon with a stern aspect, by the Canon of the Council of Trent already adverted to, and here given: "Si quis dixerit, aquam veram et naturalem non esse de necessitate Baptismi, atque adeò verba illa Domini nostri Jesu Christi, 'Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aquâ et Spiritu Sancto', ad metaphoram aliquam detorserit, anathema esto." According to this Canon—if I mistake not its import—"the explanation to Nicodemus" was intended to do much more than "satisfy him of the spiritual nature" of regeneration. But the reader has the case before him. Let him decide the point as he may think right.

After all, Dr Wiseman holds, I believe, that our Lord's discourse with Nicodemus is to be

understood of Baptism. He also holds that the latter part of our Lord's discourse in John vi. is to be understood of the Eucharist. Now, Nicodemus certainly did not—when he asked, "How can a man be born when he is old?"—more completely misapprehend our Lord, than the Jews did—when they asked, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" And therefore Dr Wiseman's own system would here lead us to expect, that some explanation should be given—at least by means of a "figurative meaning" and "a modification"—in the latter case, as well as in the former. Elsewhere the system forbids such expectation. So far, indeed, as I can perceive, the system not only fails to accomplish the purposes for which it was formed, but consists of parts as much at variance with each other as the elements of any system can easily be imagined to be.

(2) The next example to be considered is taken from Matt. xvi. 6. In Dr Wiseman's original discussion of this text (Lectures, p. 96), there was a reference to Luke xii. 1, on which I made some remarks (p. 139). Those remarks furnish, as the learned author writes, (*Reply*, p. 147) "another instance of my inexplicable perversion of his words and meaning; and, at the same time, a curious inconsistency in my own assertions." Let us, therefore, examine the matter.

Our Lord's disciples having "forgotten to take bread" (Matt. xvi. 6), "Jesus said unto them, Take

heed, and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees." The disciples took this literally; and so misunderstood their master—who speedily corrected their mistake, by admonishing them to "beware of *the doctrine* of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees." Dr Wiseman having stated all this very properly, proceeded to illustrate our Lord's conduct on that occasion, by means of what is recorded in the beginning of the 12th chapter of St Luke. "Our divine master", Dr Wiseman wrote (p. 97) "wished to employ *before the crowds* the same figure as we have just heard; and he had perceived that it was not easily understood; and he therefore added this explanation, 'Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy'."—Now, the question is, *to whom*, according to this account, was the explanation addressed? I concluded, as I am quite certain that every reader will conclude, that it was addressed *to the crowds*; but on turning to Luke xii. 1, I found that though "there were gathered together an innumerable multitude of people, insomuch that they trode one upon another," our Lord "*began to say unto his disciples first of all*, Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy." It made some difference in the argument, whether the discourse was addressed to the disciples or to the crowds; and therefore I thought it right to point out the mistake into which every reader, who did not stop

to examine Luke xii. 1, must inevitably fall. This I did, by quoting the words of St Luke. And if the case mentioned by St Luke was really to the purpose, why, I would now ask, was it not given in the Evangelist's own words?—In commenting upon the mistake to which Dr Wiseman's readers were exposed, I used the following expressions: "As if there were some spell over the mind of this learned lecturer, which left his faculties no power but to mislead—what we actually read is, that our Lord '*began to say to his disciples first of all*, Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy.' So that the opening of the discourse was not in the least addressed to *the crowds*." In opposition to this, Dr Wiseman states in his *Reply*, p. 148: "I asserted that our Saviour wished to employ these images BEFORE *the crowds*, as Dr T. himself quotes me; and yet, 'by some spell,' he changes my words, and charges me with saying they were addressed '*TO the crowds*'!"—It is now my turn to answer; and I answer thus: How it could possibly come to pass that I should, at one and the same time, quote Dr Wiseman's own words—BEFORE *the crowds*—and yet change his words, and charge him with saying they were addressed TO *the crowds*—is a point which can only be explained—if it ever is explained—by persons deeply versed in such mysteries. Moreover, people may be misled as completely by am-

biguous phrases, as by phrases directly affirming what is not true; and my complaint against Dr Wiseman was—not that he said that our Lord's words were addressed to the crowds,—but that he had used an ambiguous phrase, instead of giving the Evangelist's plain account of the matter. The ambiguous phrase—BEFORE *the crowds*—I repeat it—would inevitably lead all those readers, who did not actually refer to Luke xii. 1, to the inference that our Lord's admonition was directed TO *the crowds*—whereas he was then beginning to speak *to his disciples* first of all. What I before stated, I now re-state—namely, that “the opening of the discourse was not in the least addressed to *the crowds*.”

We now come to that “curious inconsistency in my own assertions”, of which Dr Wiseman, as we have seen, promised some notice; and he thus descants upon it:

“This is by no means the most curious part of the matter. I beg the reader to have the patience to turn back to p. 110 of Dr Turton's own book, where he will find these words:—‘When, for instance, he (Christ) declared *in the presence of an innumerable multitude of people* (Luke xii. 1), as well as of his disciples [Luke xii. 49].’ Here we have this very identical verse, Luke xii. 1, quoted to prove that certain words were spoken *before the crowds*, which in p. 140 is alleged to convict me of misleading, deceit, and heaven knows what, for saying exactly the same thing! If the first verse of that chapter proves for Dr T., when it fitted his purpose, that the discourse there recorded was spoken ‘in the presence of an innumerable multitude of people,’ surely it cannot, at his convenience, prove that it was not made *before the crowds*.” (*Reply*, p. 149.)

Now, in the first place, no “curious inconsistency” of mine—however distinctly it might be exhibited—could do away with the fact, that Dr Wiseman, instead of using the words of the Evangelist, which could not possibly mislead any one, employed a phrase which could not fail to mislead every one who was not extremely circumspect. In the second place, the preceding extract manifests Dr Wiseman’s disposition to find, rather than his ability to prove, the alleged inconsistency. In the third place, I referred to Luke xii. 1, because I wished to show that *a multitude* was present—as I referred to Luke xii. 49, because I wished to show that *the disciples* were present. I moreover considered the Evangelist’s statement in v. 1—that our Lord *began to say to his disciples first of all*—as an indication that the crowds themselves were addressed *afterwards*. In the fourth place, the “certain words”, which *I* adduced, as spoken *before the crowds*, are not the words which, according to the Evangelist, our Lord employed, when speaking *to the disciples first of all*—but observations made far on in the discourse. The conclusion, in the fifth and last place, is—that the charge of “curious inconsistency”—which, if established, could have rendered the learned author no service—he has utterly failed in his endeavour to establish.

On this subject let me finally observe, that our Lord’s discourse in Luke xii. is remarkable

for having been addressed sometimes to his disciples, and sometimes to the people at large; and that there is occasionally, in the progress of the discourse, a difficulty in ascertaining *for whom* the admonitions were intended. I now feel some degree of doubt whether Luke xii. 49, really was addressed to the people; but however that may be, it is beyond all doubt, as I have said, that Luke xii. 1, was *not* addressed to them.

Scarcely anything appears to have disturbed Dr Wiseman so much as the objections brought forward, by *Philalethes Cantabrigiensis* and myself, against the learned author's estimate of the character and disposition of the people of Capernaum, to whom our Lord's discourse in John vi. was addressed. Besides incidental remarks on this topic, he employs a considerable portion of eleven pages of his *Reply* (pp. 143—154), in vindicating the favourable opinion he had formed of them. The best account of the matter—so far, at least, as I can judge—is given (pp. 143, 144) in the following terms:

“At p. 49, the Professor charges me with having ‘a powerful imagination’, because I said that our Lord's discourse ‘opened amidst the wonder, the admiration and the reverence of multitudes.’ Now, he seems to admit that respect, at least, animated the hearers at the outset, (p. 124)... [The sentence alluded to by Dr W. is this: ‘In the outset of the conference, the people, hoping for a repetition of the miracle (of the loaves) seem to have treated our Lord with some respect.’]... This is not much; nor, I think, will any

one think it sufficient, who attends to the following considerations: *First*, That after the miracle of the loaves, the people exclaimed, This is of a truth THE prophet (*ὁ προφήτης*) that is come into the world, (vi. 14.) *Secondly*, That they wished to make him a king, and that even by force, (v. 15.) *Thirdly*, That the crowds waited all night by the sea shore, for they knew that Jesus did not embark during the night, (v. 22.); or, at least, assembled there early next morning. *Fourthly*, That they procured shipping, and crossed the sea to go to him again, upon learning that he was on the other side. (v. 24.) I ask any unprejudiced person, are these equivocal marks of ‘wonder, admiration, and reverence’? Could any one desire stronger? Or is it a stretch of imagination to consider them such? I make these remarks, not merely in reply to the passage referred to in Dr Turton, but in reference also to Philalethes’s apparent surprise at my calling our Lord’s audience, ‘ardent and enthusiastic hearers’. That they were dull of apprehension, unspiritually minded, &c. I willingly admit—so were all the Jews; but that they were under the influence of enthusiasm for Jesus, the fact of wishing to make him a king is surely evidence, or human nature can play us sadly false:—that they were ardent, their pursuit of him across the lake is certainly some proof.”

By means of these and similar remarks, Dr Wiseman meets the objections to his representations of “the wonder, admiration and reverence”—the “ardent and enthusiastic” feelings—prevailing amongst the multitude at Capernaum. He dwells also upon the circumstance, that, besides “the twelve”, there were, amongst the crowd, numbers of “disciples”—who must be supposed to have had more correct notions, than were entertained by the rest, of our Lord’s character. Something is clearly to be allowed in this respect. We happen, however, to have a more certain method,

than that afforded by Dr Wiseman's reasoning, of ascertaining the general disposition of the people. In that very page of mine (p. 49), to which Dr Wiseman has referred in the outset of the last extract, *a sentence* was submitted to his consideration, which does not seem to have secured his attention—so far, at least, as one may judge from the fact of his not having taken the slightest notice of it, in his *Reply*. If, indeed, notice *has* been there taken of it, I am sorry to say, that the proceeding has escaped my observation; and I heartily beg the learned author's pardon. The truth of the matter, then, is this. *After* the miracle of the loaves—*after* the popular exclamation, "This is of a truth the prophet, &c."—*after* the determination to make Jesus a king—*after* the waiting all night by the sea shore—*after* the pursuit of him across the lake—*after* such (in Dr Wiseman's estimation) unequivocal marks of "wonder, admiration and reverence"—of "ardent and enthusiastic" feelings—unless "human nature play us sadly false"—I say, *after* all these evidences of the correctness of Dr Wiseman's opinion, our Lord opened his discourse (v. 26), to the people who sought him, in the following terms: *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves, and were filled.* Such is the sentence which appears in the 49th page of my former work; and that sentence I will stand by, as a proof that the

people, to whom it was addressed, were a gross and low-minded people—in opposition to all the reasons to the contrary, which Dr Wiseman has produced—or which he may produce, even if they should occupy a folio volume.

(3) Dr Wiseman, as I have stated, maintained in his Lectures that, when our Lord's hearers mistook his meaning by too literal an interpretation of his words, it was *his constant practice* instantly to declare their figurative import; or, in other language, (p. 100) that our Lord “undeviatingly adhered” to this rule. Amongst the instances tending to establish the rule, Dr Wiseman produced John viii. 21—“Jesus said, Whither I go, ye cannot come.” As our Lord had several times adopted this turn of thought and expression, I endeavoured to trace his method of treating the subject; thereby intending rather to illustrate Scripture, than to confute Dr Wiseman. On a previous occasion however (John vii. 34), which I mentioned, our Lord said, “Where I am, thither ye cannot come”; and when the Jews asked among themselves, “Whither will he go, &c.” he gave them no answer. My conclusion, therefore, was—that, in a case precisely similar to that adduced by Dr Wiseman, the rule did not hold good; so that it was *not* our Lord's “constant practice” to give the figurative meaning of his expressions—he did *not* “undeviatingly adhere” to Dr Wiseman's rule.—Of the

learned author's reply to this point, the only part which I can understand is thus stated (p. 154): "Dr Turton argues that our Lord did not explain his words, because on subsequent occasions, he used the same language, and was not understood." Now without stopping to inquire—for it is not worth while—how I argued from what occurred "on subsequent occasions", I affirm that I also argued from what occurred *on a previous occasion*; and that I then proved the incorrectness of Dr Wiseman's rule.

3. There seems nothing to prevent our now proceeding to the consideration of the "Instances in which our Saviour's words were *rightly* taken in their literal sense, and objected against: where he *repeats the words* so objected to." (*Reply*, p. 156.)

(1) Dr Wiseman (Lectures, p. 100) had quoted Matt. ix. 2—6; where, on the occasion of our Lord's saying to the man sick of the palsy, "Thy sins be forgiven thee"—the scribes "said within themselves, This man blasphemeth"—"and Jesus, knowing their thoughts, said, Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts? For whether is easier, to say, *Thy sins be forgiven thee*, or to say, Arise and walk?"....."But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power to *forgive sins*, &c." In this instance, *the power of forgiving sins* was re-asserted; when, if not openly objected to, it was

secretly murmured against.....Dr Wiseman gave the following account of the matter: "The hearers took the words in their literal meaning, and were right in doing so; still they expressed their displeasure with them, saying—'This man blasphemeth'." From this account, as it appeared to me, the reader would naturally suppose that there had been formal objections and replies—giving the case a greater resemblance to that of John vi. than an examination of the passage would warrant. My opinion, which I fairly avowed, was, that it would have been better if Dr Wiseman had quoted the Evangelist accurately; and this I think the learned author will admit—notwithstanding his page and a half of vindication.

In p. 151, I quoted, as a parallel case, Luke vii. 36—50; where on our Lord's saying to a woman, who was present as he sat at meat in a Pharisee's house, "Thy sins are forgiven"—"they that sat at meat with him began to say within themselves, Who is this that forgiveth sins also?" On this occasion, our Lord made no remark upon their secret thoughts; but said to the woman, "Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace." My inference from this example was, that "our Lord did *not* always 'stand to his words' (an expression used by Dr Wiseman); nor 'repeat the very sentiment which had given offence' (an expression likewise used by Dr Wiseman)." On this subject, the learned author writes as follows:

“ ‘And thus it appears,’ observes Dr Turton, ‘even according to Dr Wiseman’s own mode of exemplification, that our Lord did *not* always stand to his words, *in the meaning intended by the learned author.*’ It is a pity that he should have added the last clause, which completely spoils his argument. I do not stop to notice the unwarrantable assurance with which he determines the meaning *intended* by me: it certainly is not the meaning *expressed* by me. For if he, or the reader, would be kind enough to look at p. 109 of my *Lectures*, he would see that I have plainly declared my reason why such an example as this (if Dr Turton’s view of it be correct) can have no weight in the controversy. For, according to him, our Lord answered not at all to the objection. Now, our inquiry being *how* our Lord answered in given cases, surely no criterion is to be drawn from instances where he did not condescend to reply at all.” (p. 157.)

In the first place, to the knowledge of any *meaning intended* by Dr Wiseman, except as certified by *his meaning expressed*, I made no pretension. What I understood, by *the meaning intended* by him, will be seen from the final clause of the sentence—omitted in Dr Wiseman’s quotation—“nor repeat the very sentiment which had given offence”....In the second place, if Dr Wiseman affirms, as he appears to do, that this “certainly is *not* the meaning expressed” by him—I must now unfold my reasons for believing that it was. In his *Lectures* then, p. 102, we meet with the following sentence: “The two rules are sufficiently clear: when his hearers, *misunderstanding* his words, raise objections, Jesus *explains* them; when *understanding* them *right*, they find

fault, he *repeats* them." A few lines afterwards, Dr Wiseman *expresses* his meaning by the words—our Lord "*repeats* the obnoxious expressions"; and this I supposed to be *the meaning intended by him*.... With regard to the reference to p. 109, Dr Wiseman undoubtedly there stated that "he never said that our Saviour was *bound* to answer the objections of the Jews;" and that "he had examined only his practice, when he *did* answer or explain." But he also observed that, in p. 100, the grand rule, which Dr Wiseman laid down, was—that "when our Lord's words were *rightly* understood in their literal sense, and gave rise to murmurs or objections, it was *his custom* to *stand to his words*, and *repeat the very sentiment* which had given offence;" and that, in p. 103, he adverted to this, as our Lord's "*invariable practice*". On the manifest inconsistency now pointed out, I animadverted in pp. 176, 177, of my former work. "Where," I again ask, "so far as the argument is concerned, is the difference between affirming that it was our Lord's *invariable practice* to answer—and that he was *bound* to answer?" And if it was *his invariable practice* to answer, what is to be said of the notion of "examining only his practice when he *did* answer?"—Moreover, Dr Wiseman, as he asserts, "never said that our Saviour was *bound* to answer the objections of the Jews;" and yet, with a view to John vi. 51, &c., we find him asserting (Lec-

tures, p. 133) that “our Lord was *bound to take care* that they [the Jews] *understood* his words.” If our Lord was bound in that case, what shall be said on the subject in other cases?...Here are intricacies, in the midst of which, as in other instances, I am fairly bewildered.

Having accidentally observed that Dr Wiseman has, in a subsequent page (172), touched upon the apparent discrepancy mentioned in the preceding paragraph, I will here submit his observations to the reader :

“Were our dispute one of words, and had mere captiousness to decide religious controversy, Dr Turton might be permitted to write in this manner. Or had I laid down a conclusion such as he states, in my Lectures; and then upon the case of John ii. being objected by an adversary, had said that my intention was only to refer to examples where answers had been given, he might, with a show of plausibility, have retorted that I had swerved from my original standing. But where, in the same volume and chapter, nay, within the same half-a-dozen pages, I myself adduce the example, and so answer it, it is plain that I had the case, and its grounds of exception, in my mind, when I wrote the rule, or conclusion; and, consequently, cannot be suspected by any impartial man—that is, by any one who will not make a personal matter of a great theological inquiry—of having run off my ground, or varied my principles.” (*Reply*, p. 172.)

Inconsistencies on the part of Dr Wiseman—not less glaring than the one now considered—and occurring “in the same volume and chapter”—have been pointed out in these pages. The truth seems to be, that the method of interpreting John

vi, laid down in the Lectures on the Eucharist, *cannot but* involve the learned author in discrepancies and contradictions.

The learned author farther defends himself, by observing that he "*might* have divided the cases in which difficulties were raised against our Lord's words, into *three* instead of *two* classes:"—which is perfectly true, inasmuch as any part of the volume, taken at a venture, might have been different from what it is. But who can feel satisfied that the rule, even when adjusted to the new division, will not still require alteration?

Dr Wiseman, moreover, (p. 159) claims Luke vii. 36—50, as a case in favour of his own views; on the ground, that the words, "thy faith hath saved thee", addressed to the woman "after the Jews' cavil (if cavil it be) may be considered as tantamount to the foregoing words, 'thy sins are forgiven thee,' and as a re-assertion of our Lord's power to grant pardon." This is one of Dr Wiseman's best arguments; but how different are the terms of his proposition, which suppose our Lord to *repeat* his obnoxious expressions, from the facts of his not repeating his expression at all—his silence towards the objectors—and his benignant language to the woman....When Dr Wiseman goes on to say, as he does, that our Lord thus "proves that he had been rightly understood," he mistakes the purpose for which the instance is adduced;—which is not to prove the right under-

standing of the literal meaning—but, from the right understanding, to prove the repetition of the obnoxious expression. I wonder not, however, that the learned author, with all his acuteness, should occasionally be perplexed by his own system.

Dr Wiseman finally hints, but without insisting upon the opinion, that the expression in Luke vii. 49, "Who is this that forgiveth sins also," *may* betoken admiration rather than indignation. Let the reader peruse the whole narrative; and judge from that, how far admiration is implied in such an expression....The words, Dr Wiseman writes, "bear a resemblance to the expression of wonder in Matt. viii. 27, 'What manner of man is this? for the winds and the sea obey him;' or Luke iv. 36. 'They talked among themselves, saying, What word is this? for with authority and power he commandeth the unclean spirits, and they go out.'" Now, not to dwell upon the very different impressions produced upon the mind of the observer, by the possession of power as attested by its marvellous effects, and by the exercise of authority without any visible result—impressions so different, that, without strong proof, it is difficult to believe that the language produced by them will be the same—let us contrast the account given in Luke vii. 49, with the accounts in the other two texts, not in the mutilated state in which they are presented by Dr Wiseman, but as they are given by the respective Evangelists....On the

one hand, then, we have Luke vii. 49, "And they that sat at meat with him began to say within themselves, Who is this that forgiveth sins also?" On the other hand, Matt. viii. 27, "But the men MARVELLED, saying, "What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him!" and Luke iv. 36, "And THEY WERE ALL AMAZED, and spake among themselves, saying, What a word is this! for with authority and power he commandeth the unclean spirits, and they come out."—It is needless, I presume, to pursue the subject any farther; and indeed there seems to be nothing to prevent our now proceeding to the consideration of two texts; which, being apparently adverse to Dr Wiseman's rule, he very properly undertook to discuss.

(1) In John ii. 18—22, we find the following narrative of what occurred in the temple at Jerusalem:

"Then answered the Jews and said unto him, What sign showest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things? Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days. But he spake of the temple of his body. When therefore he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them; and they believed the Scripture and the word which Jesus had said."

Here, as Dr Wiseman observed (Lectures, p. 105), the Jews understood the words literally,

when our Lord meant them to be understood figuratively; yet he gives no explanation. To account for this proceeding, Dr W. “commenced by remarking that the phrase [this temple] used by our Lord, if referred to his body, was one in such ordinary use among the Jews, that he no ways departed from the established forms of language;” and concluded a page of references, in proof of his position, by stating, that “the expression was one of such obvious occurrence, that the Jews *ought* to have understood him without difficulty”. In his *Reply*, p. 163, the learned author proposes to substitute—for the close of the last sentence—the following, “the Jews *might* have understood him, had they been less disposed for mere captious cavilling”. I doubt whether the proposed change is an improvement. For “captious cavilling” can scarcely be attributed to our Lord’s immediate disciples; and it does not appear that *they* understood the phrase, any more than the Jews did. This however is the primary reason, assigned by the learned author, for our Lord’s not having explained the matter:—The Jews *ought* to have understood the phrase—or *might* have understood it. Now, as I observed, when commenting (p. 160, &c.) on this primary reason, Dr Wiseman had before shown, by “a minute analysis of the expressions used in the former part [to v. 48] of the discourse in John vi, that every phrase, as in common use among the Jews, was adapted to convey the doc-

trines there taught"—in other words, that *receiving the bread of life* implied *believing in Jesus*. On that occasion, therefore, according to Dr Wiseman's principles, the Jews *ought* to have understood the expressions, or *might* have understood them, without difficulty. Yet they did not understand them. How, then, did our Lord proceed in that instance? Dr Wiseman shall, from his Lectures (p. 74), answer the question: "We discovered that every phrase, as in common use among the Jews, was adapted to convey the doctrine there taught, *and so our Saviour explained himself*." I also remarked that Dr Wiseman, when treating of our Lord's conference with Nicodemus, described the expression, *born again*, as "one in ordinary use among the Jewish doctors, to express proselytism"—and added that "Nicodemus, whether from wilfulness or error, took the words in their literal import." How then did our Lord proceed in this instance? Dr Wiseman shall, from his Lectures (p. 96), answer the question: "Our Saviour instantly explained the words in their figurative meaning". The inference from these instances was—that the primary reason, why our Lord did not explain his meaning, could not, on Dr Wiseman's own showing, be admitted, as sufficient to account for the fact. To what was thus advanced, the learned author *replies* in the following manner:

"With the exception of, I think, a supercilious criticism of a passage from Lucretius, there does not seem much

fault found with the accuracy of my remarks on the existence of the form of speech in question, in Jewish and other writers....To the authors who affirm that our Lord's expression was conformable to the intelligible usages of speech, I beg leave to add another recent commentator....I mean Dr Scholtz of Bonn." (p. 162).

Dr Wiseman, from p. 107 to p. 112 of his Lectures, presented several views of the expression, "Destroy this temple"; as affording reasons why our Lord might not have thought proper to rectify the mistakes of the Jews on the subject. On those views I offered some remarks, which the learned author has discussed in his *Reply*. On looking over his animadversions, I find some particulars in which I seem to have misapprehended *his* meaning—and others in which he appears to have misapprehended *mine*; but I despair of making these matters intelligible to the reader, without extending my observations far beyond my wishes. I shall therefore restrict myself to a very few points, which I shall mention as briefly as possible.

(1) Had Dr Wiseman—instead of stating (Lectures, p. 107) that "*the* commentators, who refer the phrase—'destroy this temple'—wholly to the resurrection, suppose two things: 1. That our Lord decided the meaning of the phrase, by pointing with his finger towards himself; 2. That the Jews did really understand the matter correctly, and objected only from malignity"—written, as he proposes in his *Reply*, p. 163, "*some* com-

mentators, &c.”—my remarks, in pages 169, 170, would not have been required.

(2) Dr Wiseman—in the part of his Lectures under review, as well as in other parts—quoted commentators in a manner which led me to believe that he relied upon their authority. Thus, I supposed him to favour the notion of those who held that our Lord pointed towards himself. The notion seemed to be introduced as a corollary from what had preceded: “Hence it is, that the commentators, who adopt the ordinary interpretation, &c.”...Of the difficulties I have occasionally experienced, and the perils I have had to encounter, in deciding *for what purpose* Dr Wiseman introduced the opinions of commentators and other writers, the reader may judge from the following quotations from his *Reply*: “Having stated that these writers maintain the Apostles to have *understood* our Lord, only they did not *believe* his words, Dr Turton takes up two or three pages in disproving this fact, advanced, he writes, ‘with Dr Wiseman’s approbation, I presume’. It is indeed an unwarrantable presumption on his part, to say so; but the innuendo was necessary, to give colour and ground to his lengthy attack upon it and me.” (p.164). Again; “Such, then, are the numerous false assertions, resulting from attributing to me what I quoted as other people’s sentiments.” (p. 167).

(3) The note in the Lectures, p.108, referred as I conceived, to the two supposed facts: namely,

1. that our Lord pointed with his finger towards himself—2. that the Jews *did really interpret* the expression—“destroy this temple”—of the resurrection; and therefore I thought it very absurd in Storr, to imagine that “so observant an auditor as St John may have noticed that Jesus pointed to his own body—which may have been overlooked by such stupid people as the adversaries of Jesus were.” As, according to the supposition, the Jews *understood* the expression—why may they not have noticed the alleged accompanying sign? But independently of the confusion of thought which appears, on comparing the text and the note (Lectures, pp. 107, 108), what reliance can be placed on fanciful surmises of this kind?

(4) Dr Wiseman has employed some pages, both of his Lectures and his *Reply*, in proving that, when our Lord said, “Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up”, he alluded to rebuilding the temple, as well as his own resurrection. “Forty and six years”, said the Jews to our Lord, “was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days?”....“But HE”, (Ἐκεῖνος δὲ) writes St John, “spake of the temple of his body”....I prefer this simple account of the matter by St John, to whole volumes of subtile interpretation; more especially when that interpretation is designed to support a favourite hypothesis.

(1) The second passage considered by Dr Wiseman, as apparently opposed to his rule, was John iv. 10—15; where our Lord “speaks of giving living waters, in a figurative sense, and the Samaritan woman manifestly understands him literally; yet he gives no explanation.” To remove this objection, the learned author replied, that “according to the opinion of *the best commentators*, the woman received our Saviour’s words with irony and levity; and did not so much solicit an explanation, as ridicule his words.” Dr Wiseman did not state the particular commentators to whom he alluded; and as no man, I suppose, carries all these things in his memory, I consulted such commentators of good note, as time and circumstances allowed. With the exception of Lampe and Kuinoel—who gave intimations of the existence of such an opinion—the commentators, to whom I had referred, afforded no reason to believe that the opinion even partially prevailed among commentators; and I expressed my doubts of its being held by commentators who could fairly be denominated “the best”. By some accident, I did not examine Lightfoot, who held that opinion. Upon this, Dr Wiseman, in his *Reply*, p. 177, writes: “Let Dr Turton listen to the words of a commentator of his own Church, compared to whom all its modern ones are pigmies;”...and finally asks: “Are we to conclude that the Regius Professor of Theology at Cambridge makes it almost a boast to be ‘but

little acquainted with commentators' of Dr Lightfoot's class?"...No reader of these pages will be surprised to find Dr Wiseman, in his Lectures, p. 77, writing thus: "While Dr Lightfoot endeavours, but feebly, to supply some such [sense], more learned or more candid Protestants acknowledge, &c.;"—and in his *Reply*, p. 177, describing the same Dr Lightfoot as "a commentator of the English Church, compared to whom all its modern ones are pigmies." Again, it was my determination, to which I faithfully adhered, to record every thing, favourable to Dr Wiseman's tenets, which I might meet with in the course of my inquiries. On this principle, I mentioned Le Clerc, Whitby and *Lightfoot*, on one occasion, as affording some countenance to Dr Wiseman's opinion. No reader of these pages will be surprised to find Dr Wiseman, in p. 68 of his *Reply*, writing thus: "In one thing, I owe thanks to the Professor's easier access to Protestant commentators: to Kuinoel and Bloomfield, he has added Whitby, *Lightfoot* and Le Clerc, as placing the transition at v. 42;"—and in p. 178 of the same work, after this fashion: "Are we to conclude that the Regius Professor of Theology at Cambridge makes it almost a boast to be 'but little acquainted with commentators' of *Dr Lightfoot's* class?" also, "Had I quoted commentators oftener, I should have spared Dr Turton's readers the perusal of much bold assertion, and himself some exposure of ignorance"; with

much more, in the same strain....Dr Wiseman pursues his course, in the following manner: "It is inexplicable to Dr Turton, how any one can attribute the slightest tendency to irony or levity to the Samaritan woman; though he, with the same breath quotes Lampe, asserting 'sarcasticum quid subesse videtur'. Does not sarcasm include 'the least tendency to irony or levity'?" On this, I will only observe, that I am well aware of many opinions that are held; and yet "it is inexplicable to me" HOW—*by what mode of reasoning*—they are arrived at:—and this is the case with regard to the belief of the Samaritan woman's irony or levity. Let me state my view of the matter, from my volume on the Eucharist:

"That the woman understood our Lord to have been speaking literally of water, when she said, 'Sir, give me this water, that I thirst not, neither come hither to draw'—must be manifest to every one; but how it is possible for any one to attribute to her the least tendency to irony or levity, in making such a request, is to me inexplicable.The Samaritan woman appears to me to have merely done that, in perfect simplicity—which others, with far better opportunities of knowing our Lord's method of discourse, generally did—to have mistaken the literal for the spiritual meaning. Should, however, so strange a construction be put upon the woman's conduct, compare it with the scornful and violent proceedings of the Jews of Jerusalem, as recorded in John viii.—or with the sullen discontent of the Jews of Capernaum, as described in John vi.—and then determine what weight can be allowed to such a reason for our Lord's silence at the well of Sychar." (p. 181).

In John viii. 21—23, according to Dr Wise-

man (Lectures, p. 98), "Jesus, with the greatest meekness, removes the absurd interpretation of his words"; in viii. 32—34, "He once more interrupts his discourse, to contradict the erroneous interpretation"; in viii. 56—59, "Our Saviour, though he foresaw that personal violence would be the consequence of his conduct, yet did not seek to modify his words, but exactly repeated with his usual intrepidity the very sentiment which had caused so much offence." After giving this account of the occurrences in John viii., Dr Wiseman urged the supposed irony and levity of the Samaritan woman, as a valid reason why our Lord did not explain his meaning; and so far as appears, the learned author still holds the reason to be valid.

Dr Wiseman—having alleged the woman's "irony and levity", as a good reason why our Lord did not explain his meaning—immediately went on to enforce another equally good reason for the same result; namely, that our Lord "had inspired her with respect"—and that "he had wrought up those feelings to the highest point, till she asked at length, that he would give her the water whereof he spake." In my volume on the Eucharist (pp. 182—184), the aspect of these two suppositions, with regard to each other, was distinctly pointed out. Of the aspect so pointed out, Dr Wiseman, in his *Reply*, takes no notice; nor shall I offer any farther remarks on the subject.

SECTION VI.

OUR LORD'S ANSWER TO THE JEWS, AND HIS CONDUCT
TO HIS DISCIPLES.

1. "THE chapter on which I now enter"—Dr Wiseman observes (*Reply*, p. 180), with reference to the fourth section of my volume on the Eucharist—"is by far the most rhetorical in all Dr Turton's work. It abounds in lengthy and vague declamation, in irrelevant discussion, in misstatements (I hope unintentional) and, above all, in his usual ornaments of exaggeration and abuse, beyond all the preceding."—By this and much other writing of the same kind, together with some considerations which will appear in the sequel, I am induced to proceed, without delay, to a subject which, in the ordinary course of things, could not by any means be postponed for more than two or three pages.

My great—indeed, I might almost say, my only object, in these Observations, has been, to lay fairly before the reader, such charges as I could find alleged against me, in Dr Wiseman's *Reply*—whether denominated "stratagems"—or "clever manœuvres"—or "misrepresentations"—or "misstatements"—or "FALSIFICATIONS of words"

—or “miserable tricks”—or whatever else happened, at the moment, most to please the learned author’s taste. With respect to my method of proceeding, I have generally been content to explain, as simply and concisely as I could, the circumstances of the cases which seemed to require notice; for the purpose of enabling the reader to form his own opinion, on the points successively submitted to his judgement. My present design is, to give much more in detail, than in other instances, on account of a charge against me, which, I think, I may justly affirm, demands peculiar attention—when I say that it was formally announced by Dr Wiseman, even in his first chapter, as something, which—when fully developed, as at the proper season it must be—could scarcely fail to overwhelm me with ignominy. Respecting the grave matter now adverted to, I offered no remark, when discussing the contents of the first chapter; under the impression that—by connecting the learned author’s first intimation, with his final statement, of the case, whatever it might be—I should have the better chance of doing complete justice to both parties.

In the first section of these Observations, the reader will find Dr Wiseman designating me as “a most pains-taking commentator on all his pages”; and animadverting upon the use I had made of “poor Estius”. Reproaches also (*Reply*, p. 25) are cast upon my mode of referring to “English Pro-

testant commentators", to whom I am represented to have gone "on the texts in dispute (and of course on no others)—[why should I?—when it was important to me to have concurrent opinions against him [Dr W.].” At the same place, the learned author expresses his sentiments with regard to me, in language which I should be sorry to present otherwise than in an accurate transcript. Thus, then, writes Dr Wiseman:

“Throughout Dr Turton’s volume, I cannot remember in him an appropriate quotation, whose discovery could be supposed independent of his controversial exercise, or any argument or reflection that seems drawn from a store of theological learning, made by previous study. He runs to his library-shelves as soon as a book is pointed out to him by his adversary; and when he does not find it—why, he takes one like it in its place! (as we shall see in the instances of Tittmann and Faber; which, if I shall be tempted to characterize as they deserve, I must seek the epithets in Dr Turton’s pages;) but he certainly is not the ‘Scriba doctus in regno cœlorum, qui profert de thesauro suo nova et vetera’. When a man calls another a coward, it is presumed that he is, or deems himself, brave; and so when one writer sneers at another as ‘not learned’ after a certain manner, we may suppose he lays claim himself to that character of learning which he denies him. For, as the Arabic proverb says, ‘the learned man knows the unlearned, because he himself has once been unlearned; but the unlearned knows not the learned, because he has never himself been learned’. Dr Turton is welcome, therefore, to all the self-complacency included in his sneer; but I have no hesitation in saying—to copy, for once, his favourite form of expression, that of all the instances I have ever met with of a work exclusively controversial in its learning, his is by far the best specimen.” (*Reply*, pp. 25, 26).

Now, whether we look to the particulars thus indistinctly hinted at by Dr Wiseman, or to the character of the whole paragraph, one may venture to say that a person, who adopts such language as is there found, ought to be quite sure of the position he has thought proper to take. If the ground he has selected will not support him, he will seek in vain for a place of refuge. He must abide by the consequences of his own act. For myself, I lay no claim to immunity from error; but I have the satisfaction of reflecting, that I took greater care to be accurate, than can easily be imagined by those who are acquainted with the untoward circumstances attending the publication of my work on the Eucharist. As to anything designedly wrong in the work—that, *I know*, is out of the question. The paragraph indeed, just laid before the reader, indicated the existence of what was wrong, in some way or other; and it formed part of Dr Wiseman's introductory chapter. It failed, however, even then to produce any effect upon my mind; for it appeared *at the close* of the chapter—and I had read all that preceded. I therefore steadily pursued my course; and now, with as much tranquillity as may be, I am on the point of stating the matter in Dr Wiseman's own words.

In Dr Wiseman's fourth Lecture, (p. 118), I found the following sentence: "I have proved already, and have adduced the authority of the learned

Tittmann, that our Saviour, *if not speaking of the real presence*, spoke not according to the received usages of language among his hearers." There was no specific reference either to Tittmann, or to the place where Dr Wiseman had "adduced the authority of Tittmann"; but suspecting that all was not right with regard to Tittmann, and the clause which is here printed in italics—*if not speaking of the real presence*—I sought for "the authority of Tittmann", which had been adduced, and found it in the second Lecture (p. 78). The point discussed was, how far our Lord's phrases of *eating his flesh* and *drinking his blood* could be illustrated by writers sacred or profane; and on that point, Dr Wiseman had (p. 78) accurately quoted, and correctly translated, a passage from Tittmann—from the translation of which, I now give all that is requisite: "These forms of expression were clearly unheard of, by any authors, and are peculiar to our Lord alone; therefore can we nowise appeal to their custom of speech." In short, the limitation—*if not speaking of the real presence*—for which Dr Wiseman (p. 118) claimed the authority of Tittmann, as adduced by him (p. 78)—was altogether unwarranted by the passage from Tittmann, as quoted and translated by Dr Wiseman himself. There was, in fact, no ground whatever for the sanction, which thus *appeared* to be given by Tittmann, to the Roman Catholic doctrine of the real presence. In my volume on

the Eucharist, (pp. 190—193) I remarked upon the discrepancy between Dr Wiseman's two accounts of the subject; I affirmed, in particular, that "Tittmann was cited to prove that which he does *not* prove"; namely, "that our Saviour, *if not speaking of the real presence*, spoke not according to the received usages of language among his hearers"; and I ended with an observation, which I now think far too lenient for the occasion: "All that I mean is, that Dr Wiseman's sentence, respecting Tittmann, was so constructed as to lead to an entire misapprehension on the subject"....The reader is now aware of the facts which Dr Wiseman had to dispose of; and he shall immediately see how Dr Wiseman has disposed of them:

"We come now to a curious specimen of 'the learning of a controversialist', so cleverly distinguished by the Professor from that of 'a student'. In my second Lecture, I quoted a passage from Tittmann, on which Dr Turton made no remark; but now that he is commenting on my fourth, he returns to it, and discusses it at some length, and certainly in a singular manner. Did I copy his style, I ought to insinuate that no doubt he found it convenient to make this translocation. But no matter, Tittmann says, that certain writers explaining John vi., appeal to the *usus loquendi* of profane authors, who apply the words *to eat* and *drink* to doctrine; that it is true that Greek and Latin writers do employ them in this manner; but 'that they so used the phrases, *to eat the flesh* and *drink the blood* of any one, cannot be proved by a single example'. Now observe the curious—shall I add the candid—commentary. 'The learned Tittmann, we see, writes absolutely—I mean, without the condition, *if not speaking of the real presence*, that

our Lord's forms of expression were unheard of. Tittmann therefore is cited to prove that which he does *not* prove.' Tittmann was cited to prove (that is, was cited as acknowledging) that the application of the phrases *to eat flesh* and *drink blood*, to admitting or approving of doctrines, could not be supported by the *usus loquendi*; and this against a special, unproved assertion of Townsend's. Does not his assertion say this? Does he not speak *solely* of *that* application? And is not that application the Protestant one? How then is he cited to prove what he does not prove? Did I ever say that he maintained the *Catholic* interpretation to be either supported or combated by the *usus loquendi*? And farther, does Dr Turton think that he would have denied these phrases ever to signify to participate orally of the constituents of a body—flesh and blood? If I should 'have acted more prudently, if I had kept this authority for my own private edification, instead of divulging it for the public advantage', what shall we say of the Professor's either blundering or unfair comment?" (*Reply*, pp. 184—186).

Here is much opprobrious language; combined with a well-contrived attempt to evade a difficulty, which could not be fairly met. When Tittmann's words were quoted in the second Lecture, they were quoted as affirming what they really did affirm; and to such use of Tittmann's words I could have no possible objection, whether reviewing the second or fourth Lecture. This unassailed use of Tittmann's words, however, Dr Wiseman has defended, with great zeal; in the hope, perhaps, that he might be thought to have defended that abuse of them, in the fourth Lecture, which drew forth my animadversions. In the second Lecture, Tittmann's words were quoted as authority for *this* proposition—namely, "that our Lord

spoke not according to the received usages of language among his hearers:" in the fourth Lecture, *the same words* of Tittmann were quoted as authority for *this* proposition—namely, "that our Lord, *if not speaking of the real presence*, spoke not according to the received usages of language among his hearers." Dr Wiseman asks the following question—"Did I ever say that he [Tittmann] maintained the *Catholic* interpretation to be either supported or combated by the usages of language?"—to which I reply, that, when Dr W. employed the preceding sentence, he adopted a form of expression, which would naturally lead his readers to infer, that "Tittmann *did* maintain the Roman Catholic interpretation to be *supported* by the usages of language." In fine, it is not easy to imagine a more unwarrantable use of any words, than the use of Tittmann's words, by Dr Wiseman, in his fourth Lecture....So much for the "curious specimen of the learning of a controversialist," mentioned at the beginning of Dr Wiseman's paragraph—and "the blundering or unfair comment" which is the subject of remark at the end. "But this", the learned author continues, "is not the most curious part of this extraordinary proceeding." Let, therefore, "the most curious part" be now unfolded by himself, the discoverer; though I think it will be found that he has not had the luck to hit upon "the *most* curious part", after all. Thus then writes Dr Wiseman :

“But this is not the most curious part of this extraordinary proceeding. I quoted the *Meletemata Sacra*—I suppose the learned Professor was unacquainted with the work ; so, like a good controversialist—certainly, not like a good scholar—he goes to another work of Tittmann’s, and from that attempts to confute me. This is his commentary on *St John*. Now in this, Tittmann, being a Protestant, interprets our Lord’s discourse Protestantly ; and says, *apud nostros*, that is, among German Protestants, there is no doubt that no reference is here intended to the Blessed Sacrament.....The words from the *Meletemata Sacra* are as clear as those from the *commentary* ; nor will any quotation from the latter obscure or invalidate the former.” (*Reply*, p. 186).

There are readers who, without any intimation from me, will be aware of my astonishment at the sight of the foregoing extract from the *Reply* ; and every reader will be enabled to form some judgement on the subject, when I state, that the *Meletemata Sacra* and the *Commentary on St John* are *the same work* ! And thus, Dr Wiseman—after treating familiarly of “the learned Tittmann”—after quoting the *Meletemata Sacra*—after supposing that the Cambridge Professor was unacquainted with the work—Dr Wiseman, I say, after all this—writes himself down, either as a person who did not know that the work, called *Meletemata Sacra*, is a commentary—the commentary—*Tittmann’s* commentary—on *St John*—or as one who aimed at inducing people to believe that the *Meletemata Sacra* and the *Commentary* are different productions. From whatever cause this strange misrepresentation may have arisen, it may,

on a moderate estimate, be supposed that nine out of ten of Dr Wiseman's readers have really been led into such a belief; and, of course, into a corresponding opinion of the Cambridge Professor. Now, whether the misrepresentation proceeded from ignorance or from design, there is something about it so wrong—wrong in such a manner, and to such a degree—that I have the greatest difficulty in deciding upon my future course. If I could persuade myself that Dr Wiseman had ever had the *Meletemata Sacra* open before him, I should certainly stop here. No earthly consideration could induce me to add another sentence to these Observations. It therefore becomes a matter of some consequence to me to ascertain, so far as circumstances will permit, the kind of information, which Dr Wiseman may have possessed, respecting Tittmann and his *Meletemata Sacra*.

The title of Tittmann's work is this: MELETEMATA SACRA; *sive Commentarius exegetico-critico-dogmaticus in Evangelium Ioannis*:—a title which declares, as distinctly as words can declare, that the work is a COMMENTARY on the *Gospel of St John*. Having shown, or endeavoured to show, that the notion attributed to Tittmann, in Dr Wiseman's fourth Lecture, involved something not very consistent with reason—I proceeded (p. 192) to show that the notion was, in fact, altogether opposed to Tittmann's recorded opinions.

For that purpose, I quoted a passage in the *Meletemata Sacra*; but having an unconquerable dislike to hard words—and not imagining that any one who had ever heard of Tittmann's name—to say nothing of the person who had written as if he were quite at home with “the learned Tittmann”—could be at a loss in the case, I employed the following terms: “In the last place, I have carefully examined Tittmann's Commentary on St John, at the place in question, to ascertain whether there was any pretence for attributing to him so absurd a sentiment, as we have just been considering. No such pretence can be discovered”. Statements like these were not destined to be put forth with impunity. They drew from Dr Wiseman that dignified but cutting rebuke, which—although it has already been laid before the reader, and deserves a far more extensive and lasting celebrity than *my* pages can confer—shall be once more transcribed:—“*I* quoted the *Meletemata Sacra*”, writes the learned author—“I suppose the Professor was unacquainted with the work; so, like a good controversialist—certainly, not like a good scholar—he goes to another work of Tittmann's, and from that attempts to confute me. This is his Commentary on St John”.... Some tolerably remarkable instances of intrepidity, on the part of Dr Wiseman, have been pointed out in the course of this undertaking; but that quality is now presented in a form which, to say the least.

of it, cannot fail to excite surprise. The volume denominated *Meletemata Sacra* is declared, on the very title-page, to be a Commentary on St John; at the top of every page, from the beginning of the book to the end, the particular chapter and verse under discussion are distinctly marked, so that the volume is indisputably *nothing but* a Commentary on St John; no other Commentary on St John by Tittmann, than that called *Meletemata Sacra*, was ever heard of, I will venture to say, except in Dr Wiseman's *Reply*:—and therefore, notwithstanding the tone of confidence which Dr Wiseman has thought proper to assume, the inference least injurious to his character is this—that he never, in the whole course of his life, had read, or even once consulted, the volume, called *Meletemata Sacra*.

But leaving entirely out of the account the learned author's affirmation, "*I* quoted the *Meletemata Sacra*"—which I will consider as a mere mode of speech—there is an objection to the inference, which I am disposed to draw in his favour, arising from the manner in which the quotation from the *Meletemata Sacra* is actually presented. The passage from Tittmann, cited in the second Lecture and referred to in the fourth, is given (p. 78) quite correctly—with this intimation subjoined, "*Meletemata Sacra, Lips. 1816, p. 274*";—by which the passage may be found in a moment. A specific reference of such a kind certainly

indicates an inspection of the work itself; but Dr Wiseman may have accidentally met with the passage, in the form in which it is presented, in some other work; and this, on the whole, is the opinion I am inclined to entertain on the subject. In spite of the foregoing objection, therefore, we still *may* believe that Dr Wiseman had not, at any period of his life, consulted the *Meletemata Sacra*.

My quotation from Tittmann was given with a distinct reference to p. 273, and Dr Wiseman's with a reference to p. 274; the interval, between the end of my quotation and the beginning of his, being about *six lines*. The numerical proximity of the pages, referred to by Dr Wiseman and myself (274 and 273), might have suggested the wisdom of caution. Dr Wiseman, however, despised caution—and launched his bolt.

It may be worth notice that Dr Wiseman, in his first Lecture (p. 30), had referred to another volume by Tittmann, with perfect accuracy—“*Opuscula Theologica, Lips. 1803, p. 661*”; and that volume *might* have taught the learned author that the *Meletemata Sacra* must be a Commentary on St John:—for the first 170 pages of the volume, headed *Meletemata Sacra in Evangelium Ioannis*, contain the Commentary on St John, as far as the 42nd verse of the fourth chapter; which, with some additions and alterations, occupies the first 188 pages of the *Meletemata Sacra*, publish-

ed in 1816....We find also, in Dr Wiseman's fourth Lecture (p. 122), a note to this effect—“Consult all the best commentators on the chapter [John vi.], Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, *Tittmann*, Tholuck, Lampe, &c.” Such are the indications of Dr Wiseman's acquaintance with the productions of “the learned *Tittmann*”....I have now adduced what evidence I could collect, and stated what I am inclined to believe, on that subject; but the reader will decide the point at issue for himself.

If Dr Wiseman really *was*—as he professed to be—acquainted with the *Meletemata Sacra*, he has used language, respecting that work and myself, which, as I have already intimated, must effectually preclude all further attention, on my part, to his *Reply*. If, again, he really was *not*—as he professed to be—acquainted with that work, still his language cannot but raise great doubts, with regard to the course which ought to be pursued. In truth, Dr Wiseman's proceeding, even when viewed in the most favourable light, is so marked by every thing that is contrary to propriety, and excites so much suspicion as to the rest of his book, that my undertaking has now become irksome beyond expression. It may be just possible for me to bring to a close this final section on the sixth chapter of St John, in some sort after the manner of the preceding chapters; but when that is accomplished, there can scarcely remain to me the power of perseverance.

If the reader will refer to a preceding page (124), he will find the following sentence, in a paragraph taken from Dr Wiseman's *Reply*: "He runs to the library-shelves as soon as a book is pointed out to him by his adversary; and when he does not find it—why, he takes one like it in its place! as we shall see in the instances of Tittmann and Faber, which if I shall be tempted to characterize as they deserve, I must seek the epithets in Dr Turton's own pages." Having discussed the case of Tittmann, I will now proceed to that of Faber—although it occurs towards the end of the *Reply*; my wish being that the instances, thus brought together by Dr Wiseman, may be seen, without disguise, in connexion with each other.

On my proceedings then, in the case of Mr Faber, I find the following remarks:

"Dr Turton proceeds to examine the use I made of a passage from Mr Faber, where that experienced controversialist compares the words 'The rock was Christ' with 'This is my body'. His manner of proceeding is curiously consistent. He seems anxious to throw doubt upon the accuracy of my quotations—by stating, first, in the text, that Mr F. 'appears to have written as follows'; and then, in a note, that he takes the passage as I have given it; for, 'on looking over the second edition' [of Faber] 'not *very* carefully he did not meet with the passage; but it may, nevertheless be there!' (p. 270) Is this, I ask, scholar-like—or is it the learning of a controversialist? I quote a book, giving edition and page—and Dr Turton takes *another* edition of the book—looks over it not *very* carefully—does not find the passage (as well he might not, upon seeking for it

negligently where it was not said to be)—and insinuates that it *may* be there;—but that of course, my minute reference to the place might be almost counterbalanced by his careless ramble over another edition! Such is the accuracy of the Professor, such the arts by which he can actually descend, to carry his point!” (*Reply*, p. 232.)

We have become so accustomed to discrepancies of sentiment in Dr Wiseman’s writings, that they pass, as matters of course, almost without observation. I may, however, just hint that the preceding account of me does seem to differ materially from that formerly given (p. 13); from which it appeared that I am “a patient follower of Dr Wiseman’s steps; a most diligent verifier of all his quotations; a most pains-taking commentator upon all his pages.” But not to dwell on trifles of this kind, let us see what is to be done with the case of Mr Faber....In the text (p. 270), I certainly said—“Mr Faber appears to have written as follows”; and in the note—“I take the passage, as Dr Wiseman has given it, from the first edition (1826) of Mr Faber’s work, p. 58. On looking over the second edition—not *very* carefully—I did not meet with the passage; but it may nevertheless be there. *I am unable to refer to the first edition.*” Such is that highly criminal proceeding, which was denounced in general terms by Dr Wiseman, more than two hundred pages before he stated the particulars of the case. He now represents me as “seeming anxious to throw doubt upon the accuracy of his quota-

tion"; when my only object was to give a plain account of a simple matter of fact: namely, that *being unable to refer to the first edition* (for I could not in any way procure it) I examined the second edition; and although I did not happen to meet with Dr Wiseman's quotation, I concluded that it *might* still be there found. He also represents me as "TAKING *another* edition of the book"—needlessly the reader will naturally suppose—when it is clear that I was obliged either to "take another edition", or no edition at all. With regard to accuracy of quotation, I had not then to learn any more than I have now, that a quotation may be accurate as far as it goes; and yet, from being incomplete, may leave the most erroneous impressions on the mind. Of this truth, we need not seek for an exemplification. We have one immediately before us. In my statement, p. 270, every thing turned upon the sentence above printed in italics—*I am unable to refer to the first edition*—which explained my situation, with reference to Mr Faber's book. Dr Wiseman, however, not only omits that sentence, in quoting the passage—but takes not the slightest notice of the information it affords, in his representation of the whole matter. To "quote a book", therefore, "giving edition and page", is no test of a full and correct transcript. We have here a sufficiently "minute reference" to p. 270 of my volume; and yet it is not merely "almost",

but entirely, “counterbalanced”, by even a “careless ramble” over that page....The main part of the case of Mr Faber is now before the reader; who is thus enabled to estimate the inference, which Dr Wiseman has drawn from it: “Such is the accuracy of the Professor, such the arts to which he can actually descend, to carry his point!”

In discussing the remaining part of the case of Mr Faber, Dr Wiseman once more connects it with that of Tittmann—and not only so, but with the almost forgotten cases of Kuinoel and Bloomfield—after the following fashion :

“On his vindication of Mr Faber, I will only make a brief remark or two. First, he says, ‘I do not suppose that Mr Faber adduced the two passages as *parallel*, according to the meaning which Dr Wiseman would attach to that word: so that, with respect to Mr F. the remarks do not seem very appropriate’. This is a common form of argument with Dr Turton. Not only does he almost assume, from one book to decide concerning another, as in the case just noted, and in that of Tittmann, but he appears to have a secret for penetrating the intentions of men’s minds. We are here to conclude my observations to be inappropriate, because Dr Turton does not *suppose* Mr Faber to have meant the words as *I* take them. It was in this manner that, on a former occasion, Kuinoel’s and Bloomfield’s intentions, penetrated by the sagacious eye of the Regius Professor, were made to annul the clear words of their texts. It is thus, that repeatedly my intentions have been unravelled with as authoritative a precision and boldness, as though he had been in my study, and in my confidence, while I was writing my *Lectures*, and these supposed motives made to set aside my clearest words. It is thus, &c. &c. &c. (*Reply*, pp. 232—235).

Now, Dr Wiseman, in a passage of his Lectures which I produced p. 271, had examined Mr Faber's instances, by means of what in that passage was called "parallelism"; and such meaning of "parallelism", as could be derived from that passage, was, I concluded, the meaning which Dr Wiseman would attach to the word. To any "unravelling" (as Dr Wiseman calls it) of an author's intentions, except so far as they are "unravelling" by his own writings, I make no pretensions; and in the case under consideration, I alluded to nothing, but the passage which I had just then transcribed. When I "supposed", as I expressed myself, that Mr Faber had no such "parallelism" in his mind, I expressed myself, as I thought became me, without confidence—not having met with Mr Faber's account of the matter; and I now humbly submit, that, if I was wrong in my supposition, Dr Wiseman would have effected more, by quoting Mr Faber's words against me, than by all that he has advanced about my attempts to "unravel" his own intentions.....With respect also to Tittmann, whose cause Dr Wiseman seems resolved not to desert—as he (Dr W.) could boast that he had "quoted the *Meletemata Sacra*", I would suggest that his best plan of proceeding would have been, to produce, from that work, a passage directly opposed to that which I was content to quote from the Commentary on St John. There would have been nothing wrong in doing

so, had it been possible; and if these really had been different works, and the *Meletemata Sacra* had been published subsequently to the other, a passage of the kind I have mentioned would have admitted of no reply. A later work, or a later edition of the same work, must be held to contain the author's settled sentiments; and I wish to protest, in the strongest terms, against Dr Wiseman's apparent determination to stand by an opinion, although afterwards relinquished, as the writer's final judgement on the subject. It is scarcely possible to imagine any writer less likely, than Dr Wiseman himself, to submit to be thus dealt with; supposing him to have either openly disavowed, or silently corrected, any statement which he had published. I have already given a reason for having had recourse to the second edition of Mr Faber's work; but I fairly confess that, even if circumstances had allowed me access to the first edition, I should have had no scruple in consulting the second also....Of Kuinoel and Bloomfield—once more brought to recollection by Dr Wiseman—I have written (pp. 44—48) all that I conceive to be needful; and there, the reader will find some remarks upon the learned author's resolution to retain Dr Bloomfield's authority, for a statement which Dr Bloomfield had abandoned.... In fine, the mode of thinking and of writing which prevails throughout the case of Mr Faber, as presented by Dr Wiseman, stamps it as a meet ap-

pendage to that of Tittmann, by the same hand. Whatever feelings the one was calculated to excite, the other cannot fail to strengthen. Far, therefore, from reconciling me to my present undertaking, the late specimens of the *Reply* have rendered my employment still more irksome to me. But however that may be, I must now proceed to the business of the section.

2. The first subject, upon which I shall offer a few words, is Dr Wiseman's interpretation of John vi. 55, "For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed:" or, as Dr Wiseman renders it, "My flesh is truly meat, and my blood is truly drink:"—his conclusion being, that our Lord "was speaking of a real eating of his flesh, and drinking of his blood." (*Lectures*, p. 121). In observing upon this, I endeavoured to show (pp. 195—200) that whenever, in the New Testament, that form of speech was applied to objects of the senses—as in the case (flesh and blood) under consideration—there was communicated to those objects some new moral or spiritual signification; so that such form of speech was very far from leading to a literal sense of the "flesh" and "blood", mentioned in the verse above cited. Dr Wiseman devotes two pages (*Reply*, pp. 187—189) to my comment on the subject—affirms that it is "a masterpiece"—thinks it right "to expose my fallacies in even irrelevant arguments"—and con-

cludes with exhorting me “to take to myself shame for such inconsiderate boldness of assertion, in hopes of gaining an advantage over my opponent.” Dr Wiseman, in short, “exposes my fallacies” in the following manner:

“He quotes two examples of the adverb ἀληθῶς (*truly*), in which the word applies to moral qualities and not to sensible realities. One is John i. 47, where Nathanael is called ‘an Israelite *indeed*’—which doubtless signified—and I will not contest it—that the individual in question ‘possessed qualities which rendered him worthy of his lineage’. The second is John viii. 31: ‘If you continue in my word, you shall be my disciples *indeed*.’ To these examples he adds this sweeping conclusion: ‘Under such circumstances and to such purposes is the word ἀληθῶς employed: and I have not been able to discover a single instance of an adverse character.’ Let me refresh his memory: ‘Truly thou art the Son of God’ (Matt. xiv. 33). ‘Truly this was the Son of God’ (xxvii. 53: Mark xv. 39). By these words, then, we are not to understand that Christ was revealed and declared to *be* really the Son of God, but only the possessor of qualities which rendered him worthy of being considered such! He was pronounced the Son of God only as Nathanael was pronounced an Israelite! ‘Can any one imagine that our Lord adverted to the unblemished descent of Nathanael from the ancient patriarch’ asks Dr Turton triumphantly. Shall I imitate this sentence, so as to make it applicable to the other passage, and to our divine Saviour’s filiation? No: I will leave the Socinian to do it. Let the Professor, however, take to himself shame, &c.”

It is difficult to conceive a more determined perversion of any man’s meaning, than that which is to be found in the foregoing paragraph. The inquiry was, whether a certain form of speech, when applied to sensible objects, tended to fix

the thoughts upon the material existence of such objects. Whenever such form of speech *did* tend that way, the instance would be of “an adverse character” to my own views. In the “sweeping conclusion” mentioned by Dr Wiseman, I affirmed that “I had not been able to discover any such instance”. Dr Wiseman produces, as an instance of “an adverse character”, Matt. xiv. 33. “Truly thou art the Son of God”; and applies to it my interpretation of John i. 47, “an Israelite indeed”; just as if the statement, respecting my not having discovered any instance of “an adverse character”, were equivalent to the position, that such texts as those last cited are to be interpreted alike.... The effect of the form of speech, when applied to objects of the senses, is—to raise the thoughts to something beyond the material existence of those objects. But in what manner, and to what extent, the thoughts will be so raised in any instance, must depend upon the particular object and the peculiar circumstances of the case. We cannot reason, with regard to the manner and extent, from one instance to another. One portion of Scripture may, in this respect, be intelligible of itself: another may require elucidation from other portions. Nathanael was “truly an Israelite”, by virtue of his disposition—in contradistinction to those who were Israelites by mere natural descent. Our Lord is “truly the Son of God”, by the divinity of his nature—in contradistinction not

only to all human beings, but likewise to all created intelligences.

In fine, from what has thus appeared, we are as fully warranted in understanding our Lord's "meat indeed", John vi. 55, in a spiritual sense—as we are in taking "the true bread," John vi. 32, in a spiritual sense.

3. The next subject, to which I shall advert, is the interpretation which I affixed to John vi. 60: "Many therefore of his disciples, when they had heard this, said, This is an hard saying, who can hear it?" My view of the matter was, that the disciples, there alluded to, were offended by more than one of our Lord's declarations, in his late discourse to the people; or probably by its general tenor, as much as any single part. On this view, Dr Wiseman thus enlarges:

"I appeal to the common-sense of any reader, who has already perused, and will again peruse, the entire discourse, whether he can persuade himself that, after twenty verses, an answer is given to a difficulty then answered, and after which two interruptions by objections had occurred, and the Evangelist had interposed an historical verse (v. 59). I appeal to the words of our Saviour himself. The disciples say, *σκληρός ἐστὶν οὗτος ὁ λόγος*: 'THIS saying is hard'. Then the Evangelist continues: *Εἰδὼς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς... ὅτι γογγύζουσι περὶ τούτου.... εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, τοῦτο ὑμᾶς σκανδαλίζει*; 'But Jesus seeing that they murmured about THIS, said to them, Does THIS scandalize you?' Will any one, calmly reading this, for a moment allow that the pronoun *this* refers to something twenty verses removed, not to speak of the intervening interruptions?.....Farther, I appeal to the

historical context. The objections which the Professor supposes to be here answered, were made by the Jews during the discourse: the answer was given to the disciples, upon *their* observing, 'this saying is hard'. It is *after* the teaching in the synagogue; nor is there any evidence that it was *immediately* after. I appeal to editions and versions which make a break here.....and consequently suppose a complete separation.....I have opened three, and they all present a new paragraph. These are 'The New Version of the four Gospels by a Catholic'; Dr Campbell's 'Four Gospels'; and Griesbach, who makes an interval of a line, indicative of a new section. In fine, I appeal to 'the best commentators'. I will not be so rash as to assert that Dr Turton has made this interpretation without 'the authority of a single commentator, good, bad or indifferent'; I can only say, that I have looked into a good many Catholic and Protestant, and find not a hint of such an interpretation of our Lord's words. I have no hesitation in saying, that, upon these grounds, this their new adaptation is as devoid of foundation in substance, as it is of scholar-like reserve in the manner of its propounding." (*Reply*, pp. 193—195.)

Dr Wiseman, in the foregoing extract, has laid great stress upon the pronoun *οὗτος*, *this* :—"THIS saying is hard". Now, there is *another* word, besides *οὗτος*, on which the meaning of the discontented disciples will greatly depend—and that is *λόγος*, translated "saying". This word, as is well known, may relate to an entire discourse, or the doctrine which it contains; and, in fact, Dr Campbell, to whom Dr Wiseman refers with regard to the division of the chapter, renders the word, in this place, by "doctrine"—"This is hard doctrine, who can bear it." According to this rendering, the discontent of the disciples *may* be referred to

the whole of the discourse—and not merely to the latter part of it, as Dr Wiseman supposes.... The discourse being ended, the Evangelist adds, “These things said he in the synagogue, as he taught in Capernaum.” Dr Wiseman properly states that the subsequent conversation may not have taken place “*immediately* after” the teaching in the synagogue. The longer the interval in question, the more likely is it that the dissatisfaction expressed related to the great body of the discourse, rather than to the closing portion. How, besides, does our Lord treat the matter?

“61. When Jesus knew in himself that his disciples murmured at it, he said unto them, Doth this offend you? 62. What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before? 63. It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life. 64. But there are some of you that believe not.....65. And he said, Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father.”

According to the interpretation which I gave (pp. 206—211), v. 62 referred to v. 42; v. 63 to v. 52; and vv. 64, 65 to vv. 43, 44. My only object now is to *state* my mode of interpreting our Lord's final observations. I do not think myself called upon to offer any thing in vindication of my views. But as Dr Wiseman has indulged in some speculations on the views of commentators on the same subject, I will report what I find, in the first two commentators whom I can consult.

Dr Doddridge then—a learned and sensible commentator, a man as unlikely, as any one that can be named, to sacrifice truth to novelty—considers the word λόγος as relating to the whole discourse, and thus interprets the 60th verse :

“*Many therefore of those who followed him as his disciples, having heard [it] said, This is a difficult and strange discourse; and who can hear or understand it? In its literal sense it is plainly absurd, and we know not what other interpretation to give it.*”

He refers v. 62 to vv. 41 and 42 :

“*[What] then if ye shall see the Son of man ascending up into heaven, where he was before? Would you then understand what was meant by the bread of life coming down from thence, as the food of the world? Or would you then believe that I came from heaven, notwithstanding the objection you have made as to the meanness of my parentage?*”

On v. 63, he writes :

“*As a key to his former discourse, our Lord added, As in the human frame it is the in-dwelling spirit that quickens every part of it; and the flesh, how exactly soever organised and adorned, if separate from that profits nothing, but is an insensible and inactive corpse; so also the words (v. 64) which I speak unto you are spirit—they are to be taken in a spiritual sense, and then you will find they are life to your souls; whereas to take them in a literal sense would be most unprofitable and monstrous.*”

Doddridge’s exposition of vv. 64, 65 needs not to be adduced. We have our Lord’s own authority for referring those verses to vv. 43, 44. My views, therefore, of our Lord’s purposes, in the discourse

from v. 61 to v. 65, are confirmed by the exposition of Doddridge.

I shall now introduce a commentator, with whom Dr Wiseman is probably better acquainted, than he is with Doddridge—I mean, “the learned Tittmann”. In his *Meletemata Sacra*, or Commentary on St John—whichever is the most agreeable to Dr Wiseman—we find explanations, very similar to those which have just been given, of John vi. 60—65. Tittmann supposes the disciples to be offended with *the whole discourse*; and our Lord to revert, in his observations, to what were considered as the most obnoxious parts of it: namely, v. 41 and v. 52. Let me record some of his observations:

“*Audito hoc sermone, quem Jesus habuit Capernaumi in synagogâ, conventu sacro, multi sectatorum dixerunt inter se, durum esse ejus sermonem; quis eum audire sustineat? . . . His sermo Domini, nempe primum, quod dixerat, se de cælo descendisse, deinde, quod se panem vitæ appellaverat, itemque quæ de comedendâ carne suâ, suoque sanguine bibendo locutus erat, his igitur hic sermo durus videbatur, hoc est, difficilis, et ad intelligendum, et ad credendum; quo audito animus audientis ita offenditur, ut eum audire uberius nolit, sermo ingratus, odiosus, invisus. . . . Offenderat illos, quod dixisset, se venisse de cælo; sed quærit, quid vobis videbitur, quid dicetis tum, cum conspexeritis me in cælum redeuntem, ubi fueram, antequam in has terras venissem? Num id quoque vobis durum erit et offensioni? Deinde indignati erant, durumque ipsis videbatur, cum diceret Dominus, se esse panem vitæ, carnem ipsius comedendam, sanguinem bibendum esse ab eo, qui velit adspirare ad vitam æternam. Quam dubitationem ut iis eximeret, ostendit, se non intelligere cibum corporealem, sed spiritualem. Respondit enim*

hoc modo: *Spiritus vivificat, caro nihil prodest; quæ vobis tradidi, spiritus sunt et vita.*" (*Meletemata Sacra*, pp. 278, 279.)

My great object, in producing these interpretations by Doddridge and Tittmann, is to show that the mode, which I preferred, of explaining our Lord's closing address to his disciples in John vi, had previously been adopted by men of character, as scholars and divines; and this I have done, without at all going out of the way for my authorities. I now seem, indeed, to have taken quite sufficient notice of those speculations of Dr Wiseman on the subject, to which I lately directed the reader's attention. And yet, on such a subject, I hope to be excused for offering, as a free gift, the sentiments of Dr Wiseman's friend Dr Lingard—if I am right in supposing that gentleman to be the author of the 'New Version of the Gospels, by a Catholic'. This writer, then, appears to think the disciples (v. 60) to have been dissatisfied with the main part of the discourse; for he renders their objection thus—"This is a hard doctrine, who can hearken to it?" He also considers the assertion in v. 41 to have been finally felt as offensive; for to the words (v. 61) "Doth this give offence?"—he subjoins this note—"These verses may be paraphrased thus: 'Are ye offended because I said that I came down from heaven? What will ye think, if ye see me go back to heaven? As the body alone, if it be not animated

by the spirit, is of no value, as it is the spirit alone which giveth life to it—so the doctrine which I have taught, is the spirit which must give life to your souls’.”....After the reader shall have carefully weighed these observations, I would entreat him to refresh his recollection of the past, by once more perusing the extract (given p. 146) from Dr Wiseman’s *Reply*.

4. When engaged in drawing up my former volume, there were two plans, of expounding the latter part of the discourse in John vi, which I had to consider:—the one, that of the Annotator on the Rhemish Testament—generally adopted (as I then believed and do still believe) by those Roman Catholic divines, who understand that discourse as referring to the Eucharist—the other, that of Dr Wiseman. According to the former plan—which to my apprehension was quite simple and intelligible, and was derived immediately from the discourse itself—the Jews misunderstood our Lord’s expressions respecting the eating of his flesh &c., by taking them in the grossest meaning, and our Lord afterwards (v. 63) directed the minds of his disciples to a mystical sense:—according to the latter—which appeared to be extremely perplexed, and was derived from extraneous sources—the Jews rightly understood our Lord’s expressions, which therefore received no explanation. The perplexity of the latter plan arose mainly from this—

that the gross and material eating, &c., imagined by the Jews, did not seem to be the right meaning after all, even in Dr Wiseman's estimation. In endeavouring to make out the manner of reconciling opinions so completely at variance with each other, I was bewildered; and I honestly confess that, as might be expected in such a case, there are, in my account of the matter, many statements very far from clear. Dr Wiseman's plan moreover, besides being liable to numerous objections from which the other was free, seemed to fail altogether, in effecting his purpose. In addition to all this, much was advanced, respecting "the Catholic interpretation"—"the Catholic explanation" &c.; as if there really were one uniform Catholic principle of interpretation—and that principle the one employed by Dr Wiseman himself. Then again, "the variety of interpretations" among Protestants—their length—their obscurity—their incomprehensibility—were themes prolific of remark. Who can wonder that I expressed some pretty strong dislike of what was thus presented to my view?

That the Jews *rightly* understood, in the literal sense, our Lord's expressions, respecting the eating of his flesh, &c.—and that our Lord offered no explanation of those expressions—are the two positions on the truth of which Dr Wiseman's mode of interpreting the sixth chapter of St John depends. Being aware that those were not the positions usually maintained by Roman Catholic

divines, I produced, along with other explanations, the opinions of Estius and the Annotator on the Rhemish Testament, as instances of a totally different mode of interpretation—which, if correct, proved that Dr Wiseman's labours on the sixth chapter of St John were thrown away. It was not probable that the explanations thus brought forward would be pleasing to Dr Wiseman; but no one, I think, could have anticipated the extraordinary language which they have produced from his pen. Dr Wiseman, indeed, seems to have had great difficulty in abstaining from abuse of the Rhemish Annotator; and with regard to Estius—whom he had himself quoted as authority, and whom I had adduced as fairly representing the general sentiments of the Roman Church—there are no terms of vituperation which appear to have been deemed too strong to be applied to him. If Estius had done Dr Wiseman some personal injury, the learned author could scarcely have pursued him with stronger feelings of resentment. One advantage has been derived from all this. Dr Wiseman has pointed out Maldonatus, Cornelius à Lapide and Calmet, as the commentators to whom I should have done well to have recourse; and now that I am acquainted with the learned author's views in this matter, I am quite willing to refer to those eminent writers of the Roman Catholic Communion. Taking them, therefore, in the order in which they have

been named, I will at once state the result of my investigation.

MALDONATUS.

v. 60. *This is an hard saying; who can hear it?* Maldonatus refers these words of the disciples, to our Lord's doctrine of eating his flesh, &c. in this particular agreeing, in the main, with Dr Wiseman. His words are :

“Durum sermonem vocant, doctrinam creditu difficilem, quod nemo, nisi Christi carnem manducaret et sanguinem biberet, vitam æternam habere posset.”

v. 62. *What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?* After mentioning the difficulty of the expression, arising from its concise and interrogative form, Maldonatus states, but does not adopt, the interpretation of those who refer the matter to v. 41: *The Jews then murmured at him, because he said, I am the bread which came down from heaven.* He thus writes on the subject :

“Sed hi ipsi auctores in eo inter se dissentiunt, quod alii hoc referunt ad id quod dixerat, se de cœlo descendisse. Nam eam etiam ob causam Judæi murmuraverant. Quasi dicat, *Cum videbitis Filium hominis ascendentem ubi erat prius, tunc nimirum scandalizari desinetis; intelligetisque me de cœlo descendisse, cum nemo ascendere in cœlum possit nisi qui descendit de cœlo, Filius hominis qui est in cœlo.* Sic Chrysostomus, Theodorus Heracleensis, Theophylactus et Euthymius.”

From the preceding extract it appears, that the reference to v. 41, which *I* supposed to be im-

plied, has some claims to antiquity—notwithstanding what, as we have seen (p. 146), Dr Wiseman thought proper to write on that subject. I have already shown that it has found favour with modern commentators—Roman Catholic and Protestant.

v. 63. *It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: &c.* After giving a variety of interpretations (among which is the one adopted by Dr Wiseman), and his own changes of opinion on the subject, Maldonatus decides upon an interpretation, which proves that he thought the Jews not to have understood our Lord's words, and conceived some explanation to have been given. He writes as follows:

“Nec enim Christus, cum hæc dixit, quæstioni illi respondere voluit, *Quomodo potest hic nobis carnem suam dare ad manducandum?* sed verbis illis discipulorum: *Durus est hic sermo, quis potest eum audire?* Durum autem dicebant esse sermonem, quia dixerat, neminem vitam habere posse, nisi carnem suam manducaret. Itaque docet, quâ ratione caro sua vitam tribuat, non quia caro, sed quia cum spiritu conjuncta est. Itaque probabiliter D. Augustinus existimat hæc verba Christum non omnibus auditoribus, sed solis discipulis suis dixisse, postquam cæteri recessissent, *verba quæ ego locutus sum vobis, spiritus et vita sunt:* id est, non de solâ et nudâ carne, quemadmodum vos intelligitis, sed de carne divino plenâ spiritu, de spiritu vivificante sunt intelligenda, sola enim caro nihil prodest, cum spiritu verò conjuncta vivificat, ut supra ex Ammonio, et aliis multis auctoribus dicebamus, sic Cyrillus. Atque hic verus est sensus.”

So far, therefore, as the testimony of Maldonatus can decide the point, Dr Wiseman's theory,

for the interpretation of the sixth chapter of St John, is without foundation.

CORNELIUS A LAPIDE.

v. 60. *This is an hard saying, &c.* Cornelius à Lapide agrees with Maldonatus, in referring these words to the expressions respecting the eating of the flesh, &c.; but he declares, as strongly as Estius and the Rhemish Annotator, that the Jews had completely misunderstood our Lord's meaning. I extract his remarks:

“Hæc quæ Jesus dixit de carne suâ manducandâ, ac præsertim præceptum de illâ comedendâ, *Nisi manducaveritis carnem filii hominis, et biberitis ejus sanguinem, non habebitis vitam in nobis*; videntur creditu difficilia, et practiacu horribilia.....Durus erat hic sermo, non in se, sed Judæis crassis et duris; qui putabant carnem Christi laniari, dentibus discerpi et comminui, debere, instar carnis bubulæ; sed errabant. Nec enim Christus hoc dixerat, nec dicere intendebat, sed volebat nos carnem suam comedere sacramentaliter; hoc est, in sacramento, sub speciebus panis et vini absconditam.”

Neither Estius nor the Rhemish Annotator has described the gross mistake of the Jews, in this matter, more boldly than Cornelius à Lapide has done, in the preceding extract. Compare it with the following note from the Rhemish Testament:

“This carnality of theirs [the Jews] stood in two points specially: First, that they imagined that he would kill himself, and cut and mangle his flesh into parts, and so give it them raw or roast to be eaten among them. Which could not be meant, saith S. Augustine, for that had contained an

heinous and barbarous fact; and therefore they might, and should have been assured, that he would command no such thing: but some other sweet sense to be of his hard, mystical, or figurative words; and to be fulfilled in a sacrament, mystery, and a marvellous divine sort, otherwise than they could comprehend. Secondly, &c." (*Note on John vi. 63.*)

v. 62. *What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend, &c.* Cornelius à Lapide understands these words with reference to v. 41; as appears from the following remark:

"Ascensus Christi in cœlum significat eum e cœlo descendisse (redibat enim eò unde venerat) ac proinde ipsum esse panem vivum, qui de cœlo descendit, quod ipse hic Capharnaitis persuadere volebat."

v. 63. *It is the spirit that quickeneth; &c.* Cornelius à Lapide applies these words to *the explanation* of what had been said of eating the flesh, &c. as the following words will testify:

"Virtus vivificandi, quam habet caro mea comesta in Eucharistiâ, non tam manat a carne quam a spiritu Verbi, qui est vivus et vivificans: ac consequenter hæc carnis meæ manducatio non fit modo carnali laniorum, sed modo spirituali et spiritui accommodato, scilicet occultè et sacramentaliter."

In short, Cornelius à Lapide is as directly opposed to Dr Wiseman's mode of interpreting the sixth chapter of St John, as any commentator can be, who understands that chapter of the Eucharist.

CALMET.

This commentator does *not* refer v. 62, *What and if ye shall see, &c.* to v. 41. He supposes the disciples to have misunderstood the phrases

of eating the flesh, and to have received some explanation in v. 63; as will appear from the following passage:

“v. 63. *It is the Spirit that quickeneth, &c.* Quand je vous promets la vie, si vous mangez ma chair, ne croyez pas que cela doive s’entendre d’une manière grossière et charnelle, comme si l’on devoit m’arracher les membres, ou me les couper, et vous les donner, comme l’on fait la chair à la boucherie.....Si vous voulez entrer dans mon esprit, et recevoir la vie que je vous promets, élevez vos cœurs à une intelligence plus spirituelle: *Spiritus est qui vivificat*.... C’est l’explication qui paroît la plus simple, et la plus littérale.”

In this manner, Maldonatus, Cornelius à Lapide and Calmet—the triumvirate selected by Dr Wiseman himself—combine with Estius and the Rhemish Annotator, in effecting the destruction of that system, of interpreting John vi, which we have been considering. They all and each of them hold that the Jews most grossly misunderstood our Lord’s expressions relative to eating his flesh, &c.; and that our Lord afterwards explained the subject to his disciples.

5. The Latin Vulgate, with the *Glossa Ordinaria*, having, for several centuries, formed *The Bible* of the Latin Church, I have had the curiosity to ascertain what kind of account is there given of these matters. It is held, in the *Glossa Ordinaria (Marginalis)*, that the Jews *mistook* our Lord’s phrases of eating his flesh, &c.; and that no explanation was given to *them*—the explanation being

reserved for *the disciples* afterwards....On the words (v. 62) *What and if ye shall see, &c.*, I find the following account of that explanation:

“Putabant quod corpus distribueret: ille dicit in cœlum se ascensurum utique integrum. Quid ergo tenendum sit, aptè subdit: *Spiritus est qui vivificat*: Caro sicut intelligitis, quæ in macello emitur sicut alius cibus, non prodest.”

Moreover, the comment of Nicolas de Lyra, published with the *Glossa Ordinaria*, is still more adverse to Dr Wiseman's notions. In that comment, it is supposed that *the descent from heaven* and *the eating of the flesh, &c.* were *the two* causes of offence; and that our Lord, vv. 62, 63, discoursed on those topics, for the purpose of explanation. The passage, in connection with what has gone before, is well worth attention:

“Primum, de quo scandalizati erant, erat quod dixerat, *descendi de cœlo*, et ostendit quod non debebant scandalizari; prædicens quod viderent eum in posterum in cœlum propriâ virtute reverti....Hic exponit secundum de quo murmurabant; scilicet, quod dixerat carnem suam esse cibum necessarium ad salutem: et ipsi intelligebant hoc, ac si daret in propriâ specie sic laniatâ ut venditur in macello, quod est horribile. Tollit hunc intellectum dicens: *Spiritus est qui vivificat*: q. d. verba quæ dixi spiritualem sensum habent, et sic vivificant.”

After proceeding so far in my inquiries, I have been tempted to pursue them a little farther. With this view, I have examined most of those Roman Catholic Commentators—for, to *Roman Catholic* Commentators I resolved to confine my-

self—who are mentioned by Simon, in his ‘*Histoire Critique des principaux commentateurs du Nouveau Testament*’. The consequence has been, that I have found Erasmus, Cajetan, Titelman, Tolet, Ribera, Emmanuel Sa, Mariana, Tirinus, Jansenius, &c. &c., although differing in various respects, yet quite in accordance with each other on these two points: namely, that the Jews *misunderstood* the latter part of the discourse in John vi.; and that our Lord, in his subsequent address to the disciples, *explained* those parts of the discourse which had been so misunderstood:—that is, on the points, the most essential of all to Dr Wiseman’s views, I have found those Commentators in agreement with Estius, and at variance with Dr Wiseman. With regard to the Commentators consulted, I employed no principle of selection: I examined those to whom I could easily obtain access. It thus appears that, whether we direct our inquiries to ancient or to modern times, we find the opinions of theologians, on the points under review, tending to overthrow the speculations of Dr Wiseman and support the conclusions of Estius.

In the earlier part (p. 16) of this work, I troubled the reader with a specimen of Dr Wiseman’s attacks on Estius. As we can now more exactly estimate the force of such attacks, I will here give another specimen. Thus, then, writes Dr Wiseman:

“I do not wish to repeat what I have said about Estius ; and the exaggerated character given him by the Professor, who in matters of Catholic exegetics seems truly a man of one book ; and of the preposterous use made of him, as though his opinions were to bind Catholics, like the decrees of a general council. I will therefore make some additional remarks on this matter. *First*, should not the reader be satisfied with the evidence I gave before, of the very second-rate character attributed by Catholics to Estius’s *Commentary on the difficult passages of Scripture*, I beg he will peruse the following judgement of Dupin, who pronounces the highest, and merited, encomiums on the *Commentary on St Paul’s Epistles*: ‘Les annotations d’ Estius sur les lieux difficiles de l’Ecriture...ne sont pas si travaillées que ses commentaires sur les Epîtres de S. Paul : et il semble s’être plus appliqué à rechercher les pensées morales pour servir d’ instruction, qu’à expliquer à fond les difficultés de l’Ecriture sainte’. Such is the commentator ‘of great repute’, to whom the Professor seems to think Catholics bound to submit their judgement. *Secondly*, I am continually reproached by Dr Turton with maintaining, contrary to Estius (according to his interpretation of the matter) that we take the words of John vi. literally, as the Jews did, &c. &c. &c. (*Reply*, pp. 198, 199.)

For what purpose I referred to Estius and the Rhemish Annotator, I have sufficiently explained ; and the coincidence of sentiment which has been pointed out, between those writers and other leading divines of the Roman Communion, proves the correctness of my views....Any reader, taking the preceding extract for his guide, would suppose that Estius afforded a solitary instance of a Roman Catholic divine maintaining the opinions there objected to ; whereas such opinions appear to have been for ages the prevailing opinions

of the Latin Church. But that is not all. Any reader of the extract would conclude that I *had* quoted Estius's *Commentary on the difficult passages of Scripture*, with regard to the interpretation of John vi.; which I have *not* done. He would infer that there is *no other work* of Estius, which I had quoted on that subject; which yet there is. He would feel assured that Dupin had not given a character—at least a high character—of any such work; which yet he *has* given. In short, with respect to John vi., I quoted Estius *On the Sentences*; and of that work, Dupin, in the very place referred to by Dr Wiseman (*Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques*, tome xviii.), has given the following account; which I copy from the English translation of Dupin, now accidentally before me:

“His commentary upon *The Master of the Sentences* is one of the best Theological books we have. He follows exactly his author, without deviating into foreign questions; and imitates perfectly his method, by establishing his doctrine by passages out of the Holy Scripture, and the Fathers, and by solid ratiocination. This commentary is written with a great deal of perspicuity and exactness, easy to understand and very instructive. It were to be wished that our young divines would apply themselves more carefully to the study of it, and take their first elements of Divinity from it.”

There is something, in Dr Wiseman's proceedings with regard to Estius, from which the mind turns away with inexpressible uneasiness.

Not to mention other particulars, only think of Dr Wiseman's giving Dupin's character of that work of Estius which I had *not* quoted on John vi.; and suppressing Dupin's character—and such a character too—of the work—the *only* work—which I *had* quoted on that subject. However unsatisfactory may be the case of Tittmann, it does not offer such extreme violence to our moral feelings, as we experience in that of Estius.

The remaining pages of Dr Wiseman's Reply relate to the words by which the Eucharist was instituted by our Lord, and to the doctrine of St Paul on the subject. An instance of unfairness alleged against me in those pages—I allude to the case of Mr Faber—has been examined in this sixth section. On looking over the concluding portion of the *Reply*, I do not perceive that I am there charged with any other proceeding marked by injustice to the author of the Lectures. Various differences of opinion indeed, between Dr Wiseman and myself, are there dwelt upon; but they could not be made perfectly intelligible, without some rather extended disquisitions, of a theological character. Upon such disquisitions I have made up

my mind not to enter, on the present occasion; mainly, for reasons already given—partly also, from a feeling that this is not the proper opportunity for an undertaking of that kind—and partly, because I am anxious to keep my *Observations* within moderate limits. With these remarks, I venture to submit all that I have written—as well in my volume on the Eucharist, as in the vindication of that work thus brought to a close—to the candid judgement of the public.









